

The Classical Review

JUNE 1901.

THE ECCENTRIC EDITIONS AND ARISTARCHUS.

A NATURAL pendant to an account of the *κοινή* is a discussion of eccentric editions or editions other than the vulgate. The result unfortunately is mostly negative, for though these editions have been less ignored by the grammarians than the *κοινή*, their readings exhibit very little definite character.

There are in the scholia some 155 statements about these editions—whether they are mentioned by their names (under the two classes of *κατὰ πόλεις* and *κατ' ἄνδρα*) or by the vague designations of *ἅπασαι*, *πλείσται*, *πλείους*, *χαριέστεραι*, *αἱ πλείσται τῶν χαριστάτων* and the equivalents which are enumerated in the books. A list of the first category, editions under their names, is given by La Roche *Hom. Textkritik*, p. 45 sq. to which one or two more cases have now to be added.

The editions, it is well known, are called either after places—Argos, Chios, Crete, Cyprus, Massilia, Sinope, or after people, —Antimachus, Euripides, and the Alexandrians themselves. A few have fanciful names, ἡ πολύστιχος, ἡ ἐκ Μουσειῶν, ἡ ἐκ νάρθηκος. Very little information can be extracted from these titles: the place-names suggest much but establish nothing, least of all a date. Antimachus (πρὸ Πλάτωνος Suidas) and Euripides (τοῦ προτέρου ἀδελφιδῶς) may take us back to B.C. 400. Sosigenes' date is unknown; πολύστιχος is enigmatical; ¹ the other names, if more than anecdotic, would only give us the period of Alexander.

¹ It may mean 'of many verses,' but how do we explain Ἀργων ἐν τῇ δεκάστῳ Δ 101?

Consideration of the readings themselves discloses the fact noticed in the account of the *κοινή*, that in certain formal respects (non-augmented tenses, vowel-system, crasis, contraction, etc.) these editions have preserved an earlier tradition.² It is natural to suppose, if it cannot be proved, that this is due to their scarcity, the slight demand for them, their scanty reproduction, and the final cessation of that. Comparatively little copying has guaranteed this much purity of text. The positive variants are tolerably numerous and important, but they do not seem essentially different from their opposites, nor necessarily preferable to them. I give as an illustration the variants on T. I do not distinguish, since it is unnecessary for my purpose, between the different editions.

T		VULGATE.
41	ἐρήρας	ἥρωας
56	ὄνειαρ	ἄρειον
	ἄμεινον	
75	ἀπειπόντος	ἀποειπόντος
76. 7	τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη κρείων	
	ἀγαμέμνων	
	μῆνιν ἀναστενάχων καὶ ὕψ' ἔλκεος	
	ἄλγεα πάσχων	

² The cases explicitly attested are (a) absence of augment: οἶνοχοί A 598, ἔλκεν Δ 213, ἀντιτέτυθο Θ 163; (b) uncontracted vowels: ἀκλε[ε]ς M 318; (c) non-assimilation: πανσούδη B 12; (d) future in -η: μαχήσομαι A 298; (e) aorist for imperfect: ἐσσεύαντο Θ 272. The other points are inferred. See C.R. 1899, p. 336.

Vulgate τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέπειν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν
 ἀγαμέμνων
 αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν
 ἀναστάς.

86 νεκείουσιν	νεκείεσκον
95 Ζεὺς ἄσατο	Ζῆν' ἄσατο
96 φάμεν	φασ'
117 μῆς	μείς
124 ἀνθρώποισιν	ἀργείοισιν
386 αὔτε	εὔτε.

Most of these readings it is evident throw no light upon the origin or date of their authorities, and do not put them in any definite position towards the κοινή. Some variants are more suggestive—the addition of B 848a and 866a by Euripides, the omission of P 134–6 by Zenodotus and the Chian, of Σ 10, 11 by Rhianus and Aristophanes, of Σ 39 sq. by the Ἀργολική, of Φ 290–2 by the Κρητική. These are more serious divergencies in the text, and slightly suggest the much more alarming addition of the fragments of Ptolemaic papyri; and the discrepancies of some of the texts used by Plato, Lycurgus, and Aeschines. Yet additions and omissions of lines are the commonest and most constant phenomena in the history of the Homeric text, from the fourth century B.C. to the fifteenth A.D.: it is only their frequency and their size that makes them noticeable. These omissions therefore in the eccentric editions though interesting are but what we should expect in authorities of any independence. Neither can light be obtained from the verbal variants however curious, N 363 ἐκάβης νόθον νῖον as the Argive edition for καβησόμεν, Φ 397 ἱπποπόσιον as Antimachus for πανόφιον (both obviously partly graphical, and recalling εἰδοντο διος τερας for εἶδονθ' ὅτ' ἄρ' ἐκ δῶς Θ 251 in B.M. Pap. 689a).

So far as some of the formal variants (*i.e.* the forms οἰνοχόαι, etc.) belong to the earlier Attic alphabet mistranscribed in the κοινή, so far the eccentric editions, or some of them, may be taken back beyond the somewhat vague date at which the μεταχαρακτηρισμός took place. But as not only the date but also the effect of this transition upon the modernisation of the Homeric text is by no means settled, the combination is uncertain. Further, the Eccentric editions are in the same dialect as the κοινή and as one another; the one dialectal variant appears to be μῆς for μεῖς which the Chian read on T 117 (μῆς is documentary, *v.* Smyth, Ionic § 543).

If the Pisistratean recension be a reality, and if its result was the establishment of the κοινή, in other words the Attic Homer,

and the Eccentric editions agree in dialect with the κοινή, it would seem to result that they too descend from Pisistratus' redaction, and are in fact variations of the κοινή. This would on the one hand give them a date, a terminus a quo, and on the other deprive them of any original individual value. Their variations would be accretions, possibly no doubt in some way connected with their localities, and by no means without interest.

The question whether all editions whatever—say in the fifth century—were in Attic and descended from the text fixed by Pisistratus—is interesting, but possible of discussion only in the case of the Αἰολίς. This (La Roche, *l.c.* p. 20) was an edition of the *Odyssey* only: and we are no more entitled than in the case of the Chian or the Massaliote edition to infer from its title that the Αἰολίς was in Aeolic. Zopyrus and Dicaearchus—however, Peripatetics, wished, as we learn from the MS. Bibl. Vitt. Em. 8 (Osann, *Frag. Rom.* p. 5) to read Homer in Aeolic, ἀναγνώσκεισθαι ἀξιοῖ Αἰολίδι διαλέκτῃ, and unless their opinion was purely academic it would be natural it should be based on some copy which appeared to warrant the speculation. The view that non-Attic copies survived is favoured by Fick, *Odyssee*, p. 26, Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Hom. Untersuchungen*, p. 257.¹

What then is the authority of the editions κατ' ἄνδρα and κατὰ πόλεις and generally the prae-Alexandrian editions other than the κοινή? I am afraid no answer at all can be given to this question. We have seen that external testimony does not carry their date back beyond the end of the fifth century, and supplies no evidence whatever as to their origin or character; and that the analysis of their readings reveals nothing beyond the survival of some early forms. Fuller evidence might tell us more, but fuller evidence is not forthcoming: the discovery which naturally raised our hopes—that of the fragments of Ptolemaic copies of the *Iliad*—shows no direct coincidence with any of the recorded peculiarities of these editions,—one of Antimachus' readings is superscribed and that is all.

All therefore we can predicate about them is that they are prae-Alexandrian and as old as the fifth century. Interest they

¹ With this is connected the similar question, were Zenodotus' dialectal changes (ἄας, ἑμῶνιος, ἱλιάδης, πολῆς, φῆ, ἄλλοι) arbitrary or based on evidence? Caener, *l.c.* p. 22 holds that they were arbitrary. Fick, *Iliad*, p. 79 and Leaf, *Iliad*, ed. 2 Θ 470 al. that they were 'hardly invented by Zen.' δ ἱλιάδης, δ ἱλῆος have now the unexpected support of a vase, H. B. Walters, *J.H.S.* 1898, p. 286.

possess in a high degree, but definite character or necessary authority none.

I have drawn this conclusion not for the sake of the eccentric editions themselves,—for two new quotations from 'Ammonius,' the only novelties, would not have justified a restatement of such familiar facts,—but for the bearing that they have upon what is still perhaps the most central point of Lower Homeric Criticism, the position and authority of Aristarchus. Aristarchus I now find myself obliged to consider, not in his wider character as an antiquary, a literary critic, or a philologist—as more or less well informed upon Homeric usage or the history of the Greek tongue,—but as a diplomatic critic. His merits in this province turn practically upon the question whether his readings are conjectures or taken from actual copies of Homer.

Controversy on this subject has, it is well known, long raged, and I will not stir its ashes. While I regard it as neither possible nor important to prove that Aristarchus never introduced a single form into the poems which could not be found in one or another book, I am at one with the doctrine laid down by Lehrs and so earnestly defended by Arthur Ludwig, that his general method was to seek manuscript support for his alterations.¹ I believe this

¹ Though it is not to my purpose to magnify the position of Ar. as a critic, I am unable to find the careful discussion of passages in Caier, *Grundfragen d. Homerkritik*, pp. 20-35—a discussion with the object of establishing that in some passages Aristarchus did introduce his own bare conjectures into his text—convincing, and I doubt if argumentation on particular scholia—all more or less imperfect—is likely to lead to any substantive result. The method must be general, not particular. In especial I must deny Caier's generalisation, p. 29, that in matters of orthography, &c., Aristarchus went against tradition. He went against the vulgate certainly, but that his reforms were based on the authority of the eccentric editions is either explicitly stated or may be fairly inferred.

The humour spent by Römer and others over the scholion I 222 (Caier, p. 25) is misplaced. The scholion simply states that Aristarchus disapproved of the lection of the κοινή, but did not alter it because he found it *ἐν πολλαῖς*. There is no 'pedantry' here: it is implied that if the eccentric editions had been unanimous against the κοινή, Aristarchus would after his usual fashion have put their reading into it.

Again it is perhaps worth while pointing out that Caier's argument (p. 31) that ἀπειρονα (A 350) cannot have been found by Ar. in the majority of his MSS., or else it would not have vanished from our MSS., is groundless. οἰνοχόει A 458 was in the Argive, the Massaliote, and Antimachus' edition, and Ar. read it: it is not in a single actual MS. ἀχαιῶν A 91 was in the editions of Sosigenes, Aristophanes, and Zenodotus. δαναοῖσιν ἀεὶ κεία λογιὸν ἀμύνει was

not so much on the strength of the explicit statements which we find here and there in the scholia on particular lines²—for these represent only the opinion of one grammarian, and him a disciple, on another grammarian—as from the nature of our tradition concerning Aristarchus and the other Alexandrians.

The scholia which convey our information about Aristarchus' readings have arrived to us in four states:

I. The λέξεις 'Αριστάρχου, quotations from Aristarchus, his *ipsissima verba*. Aristarchus speaks in the first person, and names his authorities: A 423... οὕτως δὲ εὗρομεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Μασσαλιωτικῇ καὶ Σινωπικῇ καὶ Κυπρίᾳ καὶ Ἀντιμαχείῳ καὶ Ἀριστοφανείῳ.

II. The same abbreviated and in the third person: οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος... καὶ ἡ Μασσαλιωτικὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ Ῥιανοῦ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει τρόπον A 97.

III. The authorities are lumped under a general designation, *πάσαι, πλείους, πλείους* etc.

IV. The authorities are left out altogether.

Further, owing to the fact that a given scholium has come to us in two different MSS. or in two different states in the same MSS., we have the absolute proof that a number of instances of class IV. really belong to class III., and it is a fair inference that the remainder do so too.³

On this ground I am ready to agree that any given case of οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος may be raised to οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ αἱ πλείους, in other words that Aristarchus' readings are based on MS. evidence.

in the Massaliote and in the ed. of Rhianus. Aristarchus approved both these ll.: but neither they nor the similarly attested variants *πῶν* 124, *βουλῆν* 258, *μαχίσσονται* 298, *προέρεσαν* 435, &c., have left any trace in our MSS.

² For then it would be necessary to weigh them against the expressions in the opposite sense, which testify to a wide-spread belief in the arbitrariness of Ar.'s method. Plutarch and Athenaeus are antiquarians, Alexander δ Κοτταῖος a rhetor, and all three comparatively late, and perhaps their language is inexact; but it is undeniably singular that we find Aristarchus' successor Ammonius, his disciple Dionysius Thrax—scholars older than Didymus, and as likely *prima facie* as he to be well informed—characterising their master's critical procedure in unequivocal terms.

In the case of the post-Christian and non-philological writers I suggest that the loss, or partial loss of the eccentric editions, may have given Aristarchus' agreements with them: the air of independent conjectures: but this cannot be the case with members of his school.

³ I add the figures: of Aristarchus' 664 known readings 6 are in Class I., 45 in II., 49 in III., 564 in IV.; of the latter 25 belong also to III.

But we have to define what is meant by 'MS. evidence.' As the words stand they suggest that Aristarchus followed the consensus of MSS. or at least the best MSS., and this appears to be the way in which Aristarchus' supporters regard his position.

Now in the 664 mentions of Aristarchus' readings, there are not more than 6 places in which he appears not to have followed the *πλείους* (Γ 292, Δ 410, I 394, N 613, Σ 499, Ψ 374), and in these if carefully scrutinised the inference is not always certain that he agreed with the *κοινή*. But even if we accept these six instances, the proportion is so small that we may say generally Ar. follows always one or more or all of the *χαριόστεραι* and never the *κοινή*. His 'diplomatic basis' therefore comes to this, that in case of variance he would leave the main stock of the text and follow one or more of a minority of MSS., eccentric as regards the *κοινή*, and each bearing the name of its author or (apparently) its place of origin.¹

Now, in the first place, this is not real or sound critical method. This is not to follow manuscript evidence. To desert the infinitely greater number of copies of Homer and follow one, two, several, even

all, of the members of a small, special, class, is by its very definition eclecticism. To say that Aristarchus is eclectic is not to condemn him beyond appeal, but it is an important modification of the statement that he 'followed the manuscripts.'

Eclecticism in and for itself may under different circumstances be materially correct or materially wrong, that is to say, by its employment the resulting text may be improved or it may be spoiled. It is the right method in the case of most if not all ordinary classical authors; their tradition is obscure, and the merits of the MSS. which contain them differ only microscopically. With the *Iliad* this was not so: if my account of the material before Ar. is correct, the text was contained in one main current and a number of single separate by-streams. There was no actual superiority in the eccentric editions to the *κοινή* (that we are aware of) except the retention of an older condition of various verbal and grammatical forms. In all other cases the eccentric editions, all or some of them, do not appear to deserve the preference over the *κοινή*. By preferring their readings throughout, Aristarchus was clearly eclectic where eclecticism was not called for, and is in so far to be blamed and avoided.

We are left to wonder what were the grounds on which Ar. preferred the non-*κοιναι* editions. We cannot say 'Aristarchus was the prince of critics, he must have had his reasons for rejecting the *κοινή*,' or we fall into the vicious circle which seems to underlie a great deal of what has been written on the subject: 'Aristarchus was a great critic, therefore the MSS. which he followed must have been the best; Aristarchus' emendations were all based on MS. evidence, therefore his judgments deserve acceptance.' Or, it may be said that Ar.'s merits as a critic are known in other fields, in antiquities, knowledge of word-forms, of Homeric usages, in literary judgment—and therefore his preference is sufficient to establish the superiority of the *πολιτικαὶ* and *καρ' ἀνδρα*. This again touches on a popular fallacy, the abuse of the term 'good': Aristarchus may have recognised and truly recognised the 'goodness' of readings in the eccentric editions, and still have corrupted the real tradition. The 'good' in the last resort is not necessarily the 'original.'

His method is sufficiently clear: taking the ordinary text as a basis, he suggested atheteses on *a priori* grounds; but where these same *a priori* grounds suggested to him to omit a line or to change a word,

¹ It is needful here to distinguish between verbal variants and atheteses or omissions. All that is said in this article refers to the former class only. In athetising it is plain Aristarchus was guided by internal considerations solely: but the method was harmless just because it resulted in nothing worse than *ἀθέτησις*, viz. an obelus on the margin of a copy.

The distinction made by Ludwig, *A.H.T.* ii. 135, between Ar.'s atheteses and his omissions (*οὐδ' ἔγραψε*), viz. that he athetised on internal grounds and where the line was omitted in no edition, but omitted (*οὐκ ἔγραψε*) where the line was omitted in one or more copies, sounds extremely reasonable, and may be true: but it needs to be said that there is no actual evidence for it. I give the details for the *Iliad*—

Σ 39 ath. Ar. Zen. om. Argiva.

Φ 290 ath. Ar. Seleucus. om. Cretensis (if *κρητικῇ*) is right in Ammonius).

Two atheteses (out of 386) therefore have ancient support, none of the omissions (E 808, Π 613, Φ 73) have.

It is convenient to give here briefly the results upon the converse question, the effect of atheteses and omissions upon the subsequent text.

Atheteses of Aristarchus coinciding with omission in the later text:

1 B 558 *παρὰ τὴν ῥέον* Ar. om. *b, g, h* Ven. A Pap. Bodl. Gr. class α 1 (P).

2 H 353 ath. Ar. om. ut vid. Dio Prus. LV. 15.

3 I 44 ath. Ar. om. T.

4 I 694 ath. Ar. 694, 5 om. Vat. 16.

5 Ψ 810 ath. Ar. om. Vat. 14.

6 Ω 556 ath. Ar. 556 and 7 om. Vat. 1, 23.

Omissions:

E 808 om. Ar. om. L 9, Vat. 16.

The effect in both cases is negligible.

he did not do so unless he could find a MS. in which the line was omitted or the word was extant as he would have it. He endeavoured to combine the *a priori* and the diplomatic methods, a course which the badness or scarcity of materials makes obligatory in the case of many authors, but which in a text so abundantly attested as that of the Iliad produced a monster. I do not hesitate so to qualify the Aristarchean text. For it to have been otherwise, we should have to suppose that the *κοινή* had been corrupted in certain places out of the eccentric editions (and that not all of them, but here one and here another had preserved the original; for Ar. does not hesitate to follow a single copy), and that by substituting their readings in these cases for its, the original, the archetype of all existing copies, might be obtained.

As we have seen, the information we have about the *κατὰ πόλεις* and the *κατ' ἄνδρα* does not in the least support this view: in certain graphical, dialectal, and grammatical cases,—which may be represented by the words *φύνοχόε, πασυνδῖη, κάκείνος, ἀκκληίς, τεθνεῖωτα*,—the eccentric editions do seem to have preserved an older stage than the *κοινή* of the third century; their other and more definite variations are interesting and valuable, but in no sense generally superior to or more original than the *κοινή*. If then Aristarchus' object was to restore the text in its earliest accessible form (and we have no information whatever as to what his object was), we may say that he was right in accepting *ἔλεν, οἰνοχόε, πανυνδῖη, καὶ κείνος* and so forth, from the vague authority of *πᾶσαι, πλείσται, πλείους*, whether the actual guarantee was one *πολιτική*, two *πολιτικάί*, or even one grammarian, but wrong when from the same sources he took *ἀχαιῶν* for *ἐνὶ στρατῷ* and *σκιόωντα* for *σκίοειντα*.

In short we know of no substantial reason which justified Aristarchus in deserting the *κοινή* for the eccentric editions, and it is a question whether he and the other grammarians did not obey the natural and erroneous tendency which has wrought havoc even in modern textual criticism—dislike of the bulk of tradition and preference for a minority of testimony on the ground of age, exterior, and provenance. Aristarchus produced a variegated text, out of material interesting in itself but that never existed as a whole in nature. He was in short a good scholar, but a bad textual critic; and even if Timon of Athens did not intend his reply to the enquiring Aratus to refer to Alexandria, it may be given that appli-

cation: *φασὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀρατὸν πυθέσθαι αὐτοῦ πῶς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν ἀσφαλῆ κτήσαιο, τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν εἰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυχάνοι καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἤδη διαρθρωμένοις* (Diog. Laert. ix. 12. 113).

It must have occurred to many enquirers to ask what the Alexandrian editions really were, and if the modern idea represented by 'edition' really applies to them. The like doubt presented itself to Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, who questioned if 'the Alexandrian editions were actually published' (*Heracles* i. p. 138 according to Caer, *Grundfragen* p. 13: the passage was apparently withdrawn in the second edition). It sounds paradoxical, but I have often wondered if *διόρθωσις* and *ἔκδοσις* in the case of Aristarchus were not abstract rather than concrete, that is to say, if his 'edition' did not consist in 'editing' a vulgar text by means of signs at the side to call attention to superfluous lines and other noticeable points, and commentaries containing preferences among readings. This hypothesis would clear up difficulties which remain after however much explanation.

(1) The contrast between Aristarchus' caution in athetising and his violence in inserting readings would be avoided. It is true that the formal defence may be made for him that his inserted readings had MS authority, but, as we have seen, this plea does not really save his credit as a textual critic. If his 'readings' were merely indicated in commentaries the situation is entirely different.

(2) The certain fact of the non-effect of his readings on the vulgate explains itself: if they never were inserted in a text, naturally no such text could have been propagated. Moreover the curious contradiction is saved, by which we see that while subsequent ages preserved Aristarchus' *atheteses* *i.e.* his signs, they neglected his readings, which as embodied in an actual text had the better chance of surviving.

On my hypothesis such MSS. as the Venetus A or the Bodleian papyrus Gr. class. 1. a (P) when complete, would in very deed be the Aristarchean edition, namely, a vulgar text adorned with marginal signs.

(3) Perhaps the weightiest consideration. If the Aristarchean edition consisted of a vulgar text furnished with critical signs, then the extraordinary uncertainty about Aristarchus' readings (*e.g.* B 111), which prevailed not only in the Augustan period and in the days of Herodian, but among Aristarchus' successors and disciples, be-

comes explicable. The medley of sources from which the readings are drawn, Aristarchus' commentaries, treatises, the quotations in other commentators, the assertions of the members of his school, is natural if there was in truth no actual edition to be referred to. Otherwise such uncertainty is a mystery. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's idea (*Hom. Untersuchungen* p. 297) that the unique copy was burnt at Alexandria in 47—a supposition anyhow too arbitrary to be practicable—is useless to explain the difficulties of Ammonius and the appeals to Parmeniscus. Again, though it is unnecessary to press the argument, the labours of Didymus and Aristonicus are much more intelligible on this hypothesis: if there had been an edition, one would have expected them to reproduce it, to republish it; but in fact they write *ὑπομνήματα* of their own to explain the significance of the critical signs (which they assume in the hands of their readers) and to accurately ascertain from all available sources Aristarchus' readings.

However, the language of the scholia is probably too concrete to be got over: *ἐν μέντοι ταῖς ἐκδόσεσι χωρὶς τοῦ ὧ εὔρομεν Δ 3, ἐν ταῖς ἐξηγασμέναις Ἀριστάρχου βαρείας χεῖρας H 130, ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀρισταρχείων εὔρομεν ἐνείσω B 131, κὰν ταῖς διορθώσεσι καὶ*

ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν οὕτως ἐγγράπτο B 192, and many other passages can hardly be interpreted except of two actual texts distinct from commentaries and treatises.

The lack of influence of the edition is certain, however we explain it, and the surprise that we in modern times feel at it is due to a false presumption of the relation between grammarians and the publishing trade. The 'supremacy of Aristarchus' existed only for the world of professors, and our idea of it is mainly due to the preservation of so much technical scholastic learning. Outside the school Aristarchus had a vague reputation as a Rhadamanthus or a pedant; no one, antiquarian or poet, seems to have expected to read Homer in a shape arranged by him, and publishers, employers of copyists, producers of books *εἰς πᾶσιν* (Strabo 609) never heard his name.

Ar.'s edition therefore may have been real, and yet have exercised no effect; the *σχολικὰ ἀγνοήματα* about it may be due to causes natural though past our knowledge; I confess I find the survival of the critical signs, applied to vulgar texts, in the late classical and Byzantine periods, far harder to explain, and a real stumbling block.

T. W. ALLEN.

ON PINDAR'S PYTHIAN ODES.

Pyth. 2, 5.

THE belief that the victory of Hiero celebrated in the second Pythian was won at Thebes may be traced to a misreading or at any rate misconception of this verse. *ἐν ᾧ κρατέων* might have been read *ἐν αἷς κρατέων* referring to *Θηβᾶν* v. 3: diplography with IC and K is familiar. Or again *πόλει* may have been supplied with *ἐν ᾧ*. Pindar would surely have made more of his native city in this ode had the victory really been gained in Thebes. We may compare a similar passage in Isth. 1, 12, where however the *Ἰολαίεια* are beyond doubt referred to.

Pyth. 2, 7 sqq.

ποταμίας ἔδος Ἀρτέμιδος ἧς οὐκ ἄτερ κείνας ἀγαναῖσιν ἐν χερσὶ ποικιλανίους ἐδάμασσε πώλους.

The subject to *ἐδάμασσε* is Hiero. The editors take *κείνας* as Acc. Pl. with *πώλους*.

This is surely open to serious objections. The pronoun is quite useless, and unpoetical. Also, I can find no instance of a double description of this nature, pronoun and adjective. Dissen has devoted a long and admirable note to '*Adiectiva iuncta et non iuncta copula*' (ad Pyth. 9, 6), but no parallel passage can be traced in his list.

I propose to read *κείνας τ' ἀγαναῖσιν κτλ.*, taking *κείνας* as a repetition of *ἧς* according to the usual practice of Greek and Latin writers, who prefer the demonstrative to the relative itself when the latter would naturally be continued into the second clause: even in examples such as the present where the case is not altered, though the origin of the construction may be the desire to avoid using the relative twice in different cases.

It is the epithet *ἀγαναῖσιν* which gains most by the addition of *τε*. What force can it have as applied to Hiero? The word is almost a *vox propria* of Apollo and Artemis.

Besides the familiar οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέουσιν ἐποιομένη κατέπεφνε, compare Pindar fr. 149 (116) where it is used of Apollo. The 'gentle hands' of the goddess indicate her favour bestowed on Hiero as a charioteer, and Pindar has emphasized this by the words that follow:

ἐπὶ γὰρ ἰοχάιρα παρθένος χερί διδύμα κτλ.

The preposition ἐν also is more naturally used with my reading. Nem. 1, 52 ἐν χερσὶ —τινάσσων instead of χερσὶ τ. quoted by Gildersleeve is quite different. I prefer to take ἐν as 'reposing on' metaphorically: as we too use the phrase 'in the hands of': Lat. *in manu*. χερί διδύμα is now seen to be 'with both hands' according to the first interpretation in Gildersleeve's note.

Pyth. 2, 72 sqq.

I would only say here that Gildersleeve's division of the mysterious latter part of this ode between two speakers or 'voices' though ingenious is not convincing. To take only one example G. assumes γένοι' οἷος ἐνσὶ μαθῶν to stand by itself, spoken by Pindar who is then succeeded by the other speaker as far as καλός. Why should Pindar not utter both sentiments: 'Shew thyself as thou art: true (ταῖ) the monkey is ever fair in the eyes of children, but not in the judgment of a Rhadamanthys'? So with the other breaks. Nor can it be said that the words φίλον εἶη φιλεῖν κτλ. are impossible as put in Pindar's mouth. The poet only expects and himself practises open dealings with friend or foe: for there is openness in the frank declaration that he will stop at nothing to compass an enemy's overthrow. This leads naturally up to εὐθύγλωσσος ἀνὴρ praised in v. 86. Pindar will have none of the smooth-faced flatterers, apparently friends, really cunning 'foxes.'

Pyth. 5, 72.

This passage is famous for its difficulty and for the importance of the issue involved. Was Pindar an Aegeid or not? I do not propose to go into the arguments, which are somewhat meagre, of both sides. Personally I share the view of Studniczka and others (see *Classical Review*, xiv. p. 64), that Pindar was not an Aegeid. But I cannot agree that ἐμοὶ πατέρες in v. 76 should be put in the mouth of the chorus without making a slight but all-important change. The words τὸ δ' ἐμὸν (72) down to μέλος χαρίεν (107) ought apparently to be spoken by the chorus. They are full of references to the special features of Cyrene. Whatever view we take of vv. 72-76 there

can be no doubt that σεβίζομεν in v. 80 is more naturally referred to the people of Cyrene or the chorus at least speaking on behalf of them in the first person. It is possible that all the difficulties of the passage arise from the omission of some mark to shew that Pindar at v. 72 calls on the chorus to sing the praises of Cyrene. Unless, that is, we place 72-107 (the posterior limit is uncertain) in inverted commas we must with Studniczka take ἐμοὶ πατέρες as said by the chorus (not Pindar) without warning, which is contrary to the poet's constant use of the pronoun of the first person. It should indicate *himself*, as the numerous examples in Rumpel shew to demonstration.

The reading in v. 72 of the best MSS. is γαρίητ' i.e. γαρίετε the imperative. There can be urged no reason (except with *petitio principii*) for rejecting this. The slight pause after the word was completed and before the words to be spoken by the chorus are resumed in ἀπὸ Σπάρτας is enough to defend the metrical irregularity if any of the *syllaba anceps*.

By the combining of vv. 72-107 into one unit given only as an artistic fiction to the chorus we are enabled to see further into the meaning of vv. 108 sqq. These words commonly taken to apply to Arcesilas the king must refer to Carrhotus the charioteer (v. 26). To point this out will probably suffice: but a comparison of the meanings of 115 sq. according to the old and to my suggested view will strengthen conviction. ἀρμαγλάτας has a clear and definite meaning: how can the king be said to have shewn himself a skilful charioteer when Carrhotus has won the victory? Also ἐπιχωρίων καλῶν ἱσσοδοὶ naturally points to the subject not to the prince. It is one thing for Arcesilas to compete in the ἱεροὶ ἀγῶνες of Hellas, but quite another for him to enter in the lists in Cyrene. Cf. Pyth. 9, 103 of Telesicrates of Cyrene who won ἐν πασὶν ἐπιχωρίοις (sc. ἀέθλοις).

Further, as Christ says (Introduction, p. lxxiii), *si quis non solum equos aluerat sed etiam in certamine rexerat, ut Herodotus Thebanus* (Isth. 1, 15) *singulari ille laude ornabatur*. There is no trace of this special distinction in Pindar's language.

Pyth. 6, 48.

ἄδικον οἷθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων
σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Περιδῶν.

I am dissatisfied with the common interpretation of v. 49 which sees in it an allusion to the victor's poetical temperament. The context with v. 47, especially νόφ δὲ πλοῦτον

ἀγει, seems to suggest that σοφία of another kind is meant, 'skill as a charioteer': cf. ἀρματηλάτας σοφός in the passage just considered: also Ol. 9, 107 σοφαί μὲν αἰπυναι, which shews that like ἀρετὰ it is a plastic word. ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων I take to be the same as the Παρνάσιος μυχός of Pyth. 10, 8:

cf. Bacchyl. 4, 14 Κίρπας μυχοῖς. Thrasybulus employs his wealth to further as a charioteer his father's fame: he does not spend it on riotous living (v. 48: cf. Pyth. 8, 89 and Gildersleeve's note).

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

ON SOPHOCLES ANT. 795 ff.

νικᾷ δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων ἱμερος εὐλέκτρον
νύμφας, τῶν μεγάλων πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς
θεσμῶν ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμπαίζει θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα.

The objections to the mss. text of this passage, as given above, are well known.

The chief are (1) | [~]πα[~]ρεδ[~]ρος [~]ἐν | represents unmetrically a logaoedic choree, [~]—[~]; (2) τῶν μεγάλων κ.τ.λ. must mean 'enthroned in sway beside the great laws' (viz. those of obedience to one's father and to the king; both of which love has caused Haimon to violate). But Soph. cannot have meant to speak of the μεγάλοι θεσμοί as enthroned beside ἱμερος (Eros, the god, would in any case be preferable), when he has just said that ἱμερος has vanquished them.

Now, the scribe of L first wrote πάρεργος, then, erasing the letters *ργ*, he made πάρεργος into πάρεδρος. From this it is natural to surmise that he found a γ written either somewhere over πάρεδρος or in the margin, with a mark over πάρεδρος to show for which word the γ was meant. Was not this γ (or Γ), whether interlinear or marginal, originally meant as a correction of the Π [Γ] of ΠΑΡΕΡΟΣ? And did not Soph. write τῶν μεγάλων γὰρ, Ἔρος, ἄρχεις | θεσμῶν? 'For over the great laws, O Love, thou art lord.' Whenever ἄρχεις became ἀρχαῖς, the insertion of ἐν was almost inevitable.

With this reading we also obtain an object for ἐμπαίζει, which was before a desideratum: 'for unconquerable, the

goddess Aphrodite mocks at them (the θεσμοί).

By a similar error in *Ant.* 368 the mss. have παρείρων, of which γεραίρων is a morally certain correction.

Metrically the tribrach γὰρ, Ἔρος will now correspond to the irrational tribrach

> [~]φυξίμος in 787. Irrational tribrachs are not common, but the following cases are to be found in J. H. H. Schmidt's *Die Kunstf. der Gr. Poesie*. (I have not searched the

Euripides volume.) *O.C.* 134 τιν' | [~]ἡ|κειν

λόγος | = 166 ἀ|λα|τα λόγῳ | : *O.T.* 1210

πατρι|θαλαμη|πο|λῶ|πεσ|εῖν = 1219 γὰρ | [~]ωσπερ

ἰ|αλ|έ|μον|χέ|ων (Schmidt, unaware (edn. 1869) of Prof. Jebb's brilliant emendation, writes

ὡς περίαλλ' ἰὺν χέων, scanning | [~]ως|περι|) :

O.C. 1222 | [~]ὄτε|μοιρ| = 1236 | [~]ἀκράτες| :

Ar. Av. 853 προσόδι|α = 897 | [~]χερνίβι| : *Ran.*

896 σοφῶν|ἀνδρῶν = 993 [~]φέρει|προς|ταῦτα :

Eccl. 485 | [~]παρὰ|τοῖς| = 495 | [~]ἡμᾶς| :

Plut. 294 [~]κίναβρων|ων = 300 [~]καταδρα|βεντα.

Aesch. Suppl. 635 | [~]τὸν|ἀχόρ|ον = 648 [~]δυσπο|λέ

μητον : *Pers.* 657 [~]ἀρχ|αιε|βα|λῆν = 665 [~]καυ|ᾶ

τε κλυ|ης.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

NOTE ON PLATO, *PHAEDO*, 99D *sqq.*

In this passage Socrates is describing how, having failed in his attempt to arrive at direct knowledge of realities as they are in themselves, he was obliged to have recourse to an inferior method of procedure consisting in the formation and improvement of λόγοι or concepts, more or less accurate, of these same realities. Here then we have his δεύτερος πλοῦς: so much is clear. The chief difficulties of the passage are two, viz.:

(1) What is the exact meaning of the sentence βλέπων πρὸς τὰ πράγματα κ.τ.λ. (99E)?

(2) How are we to connect it with the similitude of the sun (99D)?

Mr. Archer-Hind in his first edition of the *Phaedo* understood πράγματα to mean the ideas, explaining τοῖς ὁμασι καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν αἰσθήσεων as metaphorically representing powers of the soul. On this explanation ἥλιος = πράγματα = ὄντως ὄντα. Feeling, however, the difficulty of his interpretation of the words τοῖς ὁμασι καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν αἰσθήσεων, he was subsequently led in his second edition to adopt Mr. C. E. Campbell's explanation of the passage. Mr. Campbell takes πράγματα to mean not ideas but particulars, and connects the sentence βλέπων πρὸς τὰ πράγματα κ.τ.λ. with the similitude of the sun by emphasising ἐκλείποντα: thus ἥλιος = ὄντως ὄντα, ἥλιος ἐκλείπων = πράγματα = γιγνόμενα.

I prefer Mr. Archer-Hind's former interpretation (with one important modification) for the following reasons.

(1) The attempt to make a special point of ἐκλείποντα seems to me to involve an undue strain upon the words; an eclipse of the sun would be a natural occasion for taking observations of it, and the words οἱ τὸν ἥλιον ἐκλείποντα θεωροῦντες would probably call up a familiar picture in the minds of Plato's readers. At any rate it does not seem by any means necessary to make ἐκλείποντα materially affect the interpretation of the simile.

(2) The ideas have already in this dialogue been referred to as πράγματα: αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ θεατέον αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα (66D), where no stress need be laid on αὐτὰ, which merely correlates with αὐτῇ immediately preceding: whereas I do not know of any passage in which πράγματα is used definitely of particulars. In any case there seems to be no advantage, but rather the reverse, in using the word in that sense here, where the employment of an unambiguous word would have made all clear.

(3) The equation of πράγματα (= γιγνόμενα) with ἥλιος ἐκλείπων seems to me to interfere with the natural application of the simile. Socrates is afraid of soul-blindness as the result of looking at πράγματα; and if by πράγματα we understand particulars, the natural interpretation of the Greek would seem to be that particulars are in themselves responsible for the resultant soul-blindness; I cannot see anything in the language of the passage to justify the assumption that there is anything behind the πράγματα that is the real cause of the blindness. The astronomer, however, who looks directly at an eclipse of the sun is blinded not by the sun in virtue of its being in eclipse, but by the sun itself in spite of the eclipse.

The first objection is of course merely a matter of opinion; the second can be explained away in a more or less unsatisfactory manner; the third, however, appears to me to be more serious and to make desirable an interpretation by which it may be avoided. Such an interpretation may, it seems to me, be obtained out of that which Mr. Archer-Hind first proposed, but with the modification now to be mentioned. To take τοῖς ὁμασι καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν αἰσθήσεων as a metaphorical expression for 'all the powers of the soul' is certainly intolerably harsh; and I would therefore understand the words in their literal and natural sense, though still taking πράγματα to mean ὄντως ὄντα or ideas. This is made easier if instead of taking τοῖς ὁμασι with βλέπων we take βλέπων πρὸς τὰ πράγματα closely with τυφλωθῆναι and τοῖς ὁμασι καὶ ἐκάστη τῶν αἰσθήσεων as one phrase going with ἐπιχειρῶν ἀπεισθαι αὐτῶν. What I imagine Socrates to say is: 'I feared that I might be utterly blinded in soul through looking at realities, if I attempted to apprehend them by means of the eyes and each of the other senses'; i.e. 'if I attempted to make use of material nature, which is apprehended by the senses, as a means towards the attainment of knowledge of realities.' Rather the observation of phenomena should be directed, not immediately to the attainment of knowledge, but to the formation of λόγοι, and these λόγοι should then be used as a means for studying realities. It seems to me that in this way we have a consistent and satisfactory explanation of this most perplexing passage.

R. K. GAYE.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S *QUAESTIONES CONVIVALES* [BERNARDAKIS].

P. 149, 17. τὸ μὲν ποικίλον ἥδιον ἐστὶ, τὸ δ' ἥδιον εὐορεκτότερον, ἂν τὴν ὑπερ<βολὴν καὶ τᾶγ> ἀφέλῃς· προσφύεται γὰρ ὀργῶντι καὶ δεχομένῳ τῷ σώματι—. τὸ δ' ἀνόρεκτον πλανώμενον καὶ ῥεμβόμενον ἢ παντάσῃν ἐξέβαλεν ἢ φύσις, ἢ μόλις ὑπ' ἐνδείας ἔστερξεν. The subject of προσφύεται is τὸ εὐορεκτόν, to which in the following clause τὸ ἀνόρεκτον is opposed. The argument is that what is εὐορεκτόν is more healthy than what is ἀνόρεκτον. Therefore it seems certain that, after εὐορεκτότερον, τὸ δ' εὐορεκτόν ὑγιεινότερον has fallen out owing to the homoioteleuton.

P. 153, 13. προσελθόντα has no one to whom it can be referred, as it cannot grammatically be referred to the man mentioned in the parenthesis above. Probably τὸν ἄρχοντα has fallen out after it.

P. 154, 18. οὕτω φήσει τις καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑφ' ἡδονῆς φιλοσοφῆσαντας περὶ τῶν ὕδων ἀμφισβητήσιμον ἐχόντων τὴν γένεσιν, ὥς ὁ ρᾶς lac. 3 litt. ἐν δὲ τούτοις ὑποκειμένης τῷ λόγῳ τῆς εὐπειθείας καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν lac. 3 litt. προδήλῳ τῷ εἶναι πειθούσης. I suggest, although it involves three transpositions, ὑφ' ἡδονῆς φιλοσοφῆσαι τὰ περὶ τῶν ὕδων ὥς ἀμφισβητήσιμον ἐχόντων τὴν γένεσιν, ρᾶς<των>ενέειν>δ' ἐν τούτοις, ὑποκειμένης τῷ λόγῳ τῆς εὐπειθείας (ita Bern.) καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν <εἶναι> τῷ προδήλῳ εἶναι πειθούσης. This gives the required sense 'So some one will say that we too were moved by pleasure to philosophise about the truffles, as if their origin were doubtful, but that we will not exercise our wits about this matter, since physical enjoyment is at the bottom of our discussion and persuades us in this case not to trouble ourselves about the cause of the phenomenon since that is self-evident.' For ρᾶστωνεἶναι δ' ἐν τούτοις, it might be better to suggest ρᾶ<θυμ>ε<ι>ν δ' ἐ<ν> τούτοις, the damaged passage having been thus in the uncial MS. PAC... ΕΙΝΔΕΤΟΥΤΟΙC.

P. 158, 17. ὥς ὁ Μένανδρος πρὸς τὸν κελεύοντα ταῖς λοιπάσι περιφράττειν lac. 4 litt. ὡπὸν δεινῶς lac. 5 litt. οὐ πράγμα νύμφης λέγεις. It seems evident that Menander's line ran thus δεινῶς . . . οὐ φράγμα κοῦ νύμφης λέγεις. Possibly περιφράττειν <τὴν ἀσ>ωτον.

P. 170, 18. τοῖς σώμασιν is evidently wrong. Perhaps τοῖς ξίω μέρεσιν.

P. 193, 14. ἐφάνη μοι (sc. Ὀνησικράτης) τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος 'αὐξομένη πόλις οὐ πόλιν' συμποσία δεδόςθαι. No doubt Benseler's αὐξομένην πόλιν is right.

There can however be little doubt that the subject of ἐφάνη is Onesicrates, and therefore that δεδόςθαι is corrupt and should be changed to δέχεσθαι. But I cannot decide how we should correct συμποσία. ἐπὶ συμποσίοις ἀποδέχεσθαι would give the required sense.

P. 237, 9. ὑποσκαφισμοί. There is no part of the process of cleaning corn to which this word could be applied, and we should restore ὑποσκαριφισμοί i.e. scraping lightly with the hand to get rid of stones, &c. This, when corn is pounded and ground at home, is done after the pounding. The larger impurities are thus eliminated, and subsequently the smaller ones are sifted off. L. and S. s.v. ὑποσκαφισμός cite ὑποσκαριφισμός in the same sense, but without a reference. It should certainly be restored to Plutarch and ὑποσκαφισμός should disappear from *Lexika*.

P. 239, 13. We should write παρὰ τῶν τειχοφυλάκων πολεμίων <όντων>.

P. 245, 12. οὔτε γὰρ μέλιτος οὐθ' ὕδατος, οὔτ' ἄλλου τινὸς ὑγροῦ βραχὺς οὕτως ὅπως ἐπίδοσιν λαμβάνει τοιαύτην, ἀλλ' εὐθύς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον καὶ ἀναλίσκεται διὰ ξηρότητα τὸ δ' ἔλαιον . . . ἀγεται περὶ τὸ σῶμα χριομένοις κ.τ.λ. ἐπιλείπων καταναλίσκεται Bern., but this is too much of a tautology to be possible. Restore ἐπιπολάζων καταναλίσκεται.

P. 246, 23 sq. Plutarch is talking of the use of fig juice for curdling milk. καὶ τὴν πῆξιν ἐμποιεῖν τῷ γάλακτι τὸν ὅπὸν οἰονταί τινες, οὐ σκαληνία σχημάτων περιπλέκοντα καὶ κολώντα τὰ μέρη τοῦ γάλακτος . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ θερμότητος ἐκτῆκοντα τὸ ἀσύστατον καὶ ὕδατῶδες i.e. the whey. The text continues τεκμήριον δὲ τὸ ἀχρηστον γλυκὺ εἶναι τὸν ὅπὸν, ἀλλὰ πωμάτων φαυλότατον, which is certainly corrupt and, as far as intelligible, ridiculous, for it states that the juice of the unripe fig is drunk and that it is sweet. It is not of course drunk and it is very bitter. We may with certainty restore τεκμήριον δὲ τὸ ἀχρηστον γλυκὺ <ν γὰρ> εἶναι τὸν ὅπὸν ἀλλὰ πωμάτων φαυλότατον. I have tried the experiment of curdling milk with the juice of the unripe fig. The curds were so bitter that I did not try the whey. I suppose that I put too much fig juice in.

P. 251, 24. οὐκ ἂν δὲ ταῦτα συνέβαινε διακρινόμενον εὐθύς ἐν τῇ καταπόσει τῶν ὑγρῶν ἀλλ' οὐ συμπλεκόμενον ἡμῶν ἅμα καὶ συμπαρεπεμπόντων τὸ στίον. The subject

of συμπλεκόμενων καὶ συμπαραπεμπόντων is obviously τὰ ὑγρά. So ἡμῶν ἅμα is corrupt. Probably ἡρέμα.

P. 255, 11. δάψος περιφλεγέστατον. Was the medical term for violent thirst, περιφλεγές or πυριφλεγές? L. and S. quote περιφλεγές from this and another passage in Plutarch, πυριφλεγές from medical writers. The term in use must have been one and the same in all the instances. πυριφλεγές seems the more probable.

P. 279, 16. δεδοκότες τοῖς ἐστιῶσι. It is curious that no editor has observed that the sense requires not 'to the entertainers,' but 'to the entertained.' Restore οἷς ἐστιῶσι 'to those whom they entertain.'

P. 282, 2. εἰ δὲ μὴ, τῶν ἰδίων φίλων οὓς ἂν καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτοὺς ἐλέσθαι ὁ δειπνίζων, ἐπεικὴς ὧν ἐπεικεῖς, καὶ φιλόλογος φιλολόγους ὄντας, ἢ δυνατοὺς δυνάμενος, πάλαι καὶ ζητῶν ἀμωσγέπως αὐτοῖς ἐν προσηγορίᾳ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ γενέσθαι. Instead of excluding καὶ with Wytttenbach we should supply a participle before πάλαι e.g. <σεβόμενος> πάλαι καὶ ζητῶν.

P. 305, 9. ἦκε δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐπὶ μνήμῃν ἐν Πυθίοις γενόμενος, πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ὕμνων τῷ θεῷ χορηγός. A comma after γενόμενος is necessary. Pindar was born during the Pythian festival. Without the comma the sentence is liable to be misunderstood. I had misunderstood it, until Prof. von Wilamowitz pointed out to me this simple expedient.

P. 316, 16. αἱ μὲν πρώται σου τῶν ὑποθέσεων . . . περὶ πολλὸν τὸ κενὸν ἔχουσιν μενέτωσαν. We should, I think, restore καίπερ πολὺν.

P. 323, 24. κάκει (at Delphi) πρῶτον ἐπὶ τιμῇ, τοῦ θεοῦ δάφνη καὶ φοίνικι τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκόσμησαν ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῷ θεῷ μὴ δάφνας μὴδ' ἐλαίας, ἀλλὰ φοίνικας ἀνατιθέντες. Herwerden proposes the exclusion of δάφνη καὶ; but it is difficult to regard it as an interpolation. What the speaker wished to say was perhaps that the crowns at Delphi were originally made of laurel, but made to look as if they were of palm; just as at present the Palm-Sunday branches are artificial palm branches. Perhaps δαφνίνῳ φοίνικι.

P. 334, 12. The stork, allowed to make its nest near houses, gives ἐπιβαθρόν τι γῆς, because it kills snakes etc. Reiske has proposed στεγῆς for γῆς, but this can scarcely be right, as the stork cannot be said to receive shelter; in fact Plutarch has just said that it does not receive shelter or help. ἐπιβαθρόν τι τῆς <διαίτης> δίδωσι should, I think, be restored. It is evident that διαίτης may easily have been omitted by a scribe whose eye skipped from one ΤΗCΔΙ to another; and then τῆς was changed to γῆς by a bad conjecture. What the stork pays for is simply its δίαίτα with men and no more.

W. R. PATON.

Calymnos.

NOTE ON φοναί.

THE poetical word φονή appears to have been used only in the plural. So far as the Lexicon shows, it occurs eleven times, and always in the dat.; but probably Soph. *Ant.* 1003 should be deducted, and we should certainly add Soph. *Tr.* 558, and possibly other instances of φονῶν not yet identified. The word is found once with ἀμφί (*Il.* 15, 633), and nine times with ἐν, if ἐν φοναῖς is read in Ar. *Av.* 1070. In Soph. *Ant.* 1003 we have φοναῖς alone. An examination of the examples shows that φοναί is not (as would appear from L. and S., and as is commonly supposed) a synonym of φόνος; for it never denotes the 'act of killing,' but always (1) 'blood' (shed), or (2) 'bloody corpses or carcases,' 'carnage.' The passages fall into three groups. (A) Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 37 πέφνεν τε ματέρα θῆκε τ' Αἰγισθον ἐν φοναῖς, 'laid him

weltering in his blood.' Aesch. *Ag.* 446 ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ', 'fallen nobly in his own blood.' Soph. *Ant.* 696 ἐν φοναῖς | πεπτῶτ' ἄθραπτον, 'lying in his blood where he fell, unburied.' Eur. *El.* 1206 (Orestes speaks to Elektra after killing his mother. He had plunged his sword into Klytaimnestra's neck, covering his eyes with his ἱμάτιον as he struck the blow.) κατέϊδες οἷον ἢ τάλαν' ἱέων πέπλων | ἔβαλεν (so mss.: for ἔξω πέπλων ἀμαλόν, or ἀπαλόν?) ἔδειξε μαστὸν, ἐν φοναῖσιν—| ἰώ μοι—πρὸς πέδῳ | τιθεῖσα γόνιμα μέλεα, 'as in its blood the body that bare me sank to the ground?' To take ἐν φοναῖσιν with ἔδειξε μαστὸν would throw an improper emphasis on πρὸς πέδῳ.—(B) In the next three examples we have a modal adverb; 'in blood' means 'bloodily.' Soph. *Ant.* 1314 ποίῳ δὲ κάπελῦσατ' ἐν φοναῖς τρόπῳ;

'what was the manner of her bloody end?' Ar. *Av.* 1070 (a mock-tragic passage) ἐρπετά τε καὶ δακετὰ πᾶνθ' ὅσαπερ | ἔστιν ὑπ' ἐμᾶς πτέρυγος ἐν φοναῖς ὀλλυται, 'they come to a bloody end.' The MSS. here give φοναῖσιν ἐξόλλυται, which is metrically unsound. Edd. are divided between ἐκ φοναῖς ὀλλυται and ἐν φοναῖς ὀλλυται. The corruption probably arose from the omission of ἐν. Then, it being assumed that φοναῖς could mean 'killing,' the remaining words were altered to φοναῖσιν ἐξόλλυται, in order to effect a clumsy restoration of the metre. The tmesis ἐκ...ὀλλυται seems unlikely. Eur. *El.* 154 ἀπεστι δι' | κυσὶν πεποιθὼς ἐν φοναῖς θηροκτόνοις, 'dogs that kill wild beasts, spilling their blood.' We might include here Soph. *Ant.* 1003 [ὄρνιθας] σπῶντας ἐν χηλαῖσιν ἀλλήλους φοναῖς, 'bloodily,' but the absence of ἐν makes it better to take φοναῖς as an adj. meaning 'bloody' or 'murderous'; cp. τομός, τροφός, τορός. The Schol.'s note is ταῖς αἱματικαῖς. (c) *Il.* 10, 521 (Hippokoon wakes and looks on the work of Odysseus and Diomedes) ὡς ἴδε... | ἄνδρας τ' ἀσπαίροντας ἐν ἀργαλέῃσι φονῇσιν, 'gasping in death amid the dreadful carnage.' *Il.* 15, 633 θηρὶ μαχίσσασθαι ἔλικος βοὸς ἀμφὶ φονῇσιν, 'to fight over the carcase of the ox,' which the lion has already slain. Her. 9, 76 ἔτι ἐν τῇσι φονῇσι ἑόντας, 'while still standing amid the carnage.' It is nothing short of amazing that not only L. and S., but the edd. and translators (so far as I have been able to discover) should take this to mean 'while still engaged in the act of slaying.' The passage is from the story of the Koan woman who, after the battle of Plataia was over (as Her. expressly states), came in a carriage to the Lacedaemonians, while they were ἔτι ἐν τῇσι φονῇσι, and asked to speak to Pausanias. Were the Lacedaemonians butchering the wounded?

We have no doubt another instance of

the word in Soph. *Tr.* 558 δῶρον...δ παῖς ἔτ' οὔσα τοῦ δασυστέρνον παρὰ | Νέσσου φθίνοντος ἐκ φονῶν ἀνειλόμην, 'took up from the blood.' The δῶρον was a few drops of the creature's blood. The lemma of the schol. in L reads φόνων, but explains by αἵματος. Jebb reads φονῶν, translating 'wounds.' The prep. ἐκ makes φονῶν seem preferable to φόνων in Soph. *El.* 11 ὅθεν σε πατὴρ ἐκ φονῶν ἐγὼ ποτε | πρὸς σῆς ὁμαίμου καὶ κασιγνήτης λαβὼν | ἦνεγκα, 'whence, from amid thy slain father's blood, I took thee from thy sister's hands,' &c. There is a distinct gain in vividness with φονῶν, and the statement may be almost literally true; the children may have been present at the murder.

Since ἐν φοναῖς, 'in blood,' was so well established, ἐκ φονῶν, 'out of blood,' cannot be said to be an unlikely expression. Indeed, it would probably recur more frequently, were it not that even the most bloodthirsty of peoples would rarely have need to say 'out of (shed) blood.'

The notion that φοναῖ could mean 'place of slaughter' appears to have its origin in a schol. on *Il.* 15, 633. It reappears in Hesych. and the schol. on Pind. *P.* 2, 37; but even the passages quoted from later writers lend it no support. Aelian *N.A.* 3, 21 (a lion and lioness, returning to their lair, find that their cubs have been killed by a bear) ἐπεὶ δὲ...εἶδον τοὺς παῖδας ἐν ταῖς φοναῖς, 'in their blood' (φόνους is a v.l.). *Ibid.* 1, 18 φοναῖς should no doubt be restored. When a young dolphin has been harpooned and drawn up to the boat, the mother follows, τὸν παῖδα οὐχ ὑπομένονσα ἀπολιπεῖν ἐν τοῖς φόνους ὄντα. In Menand. (6th century A.D.) *Hist. Exc.*, p. 321 ed. Nieb., quoted in Steph. *Thes.*, anyone who cares to look at the passage will see that φοναῖς is a mere blunder for ποιναῖς.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

THE GREEK WORDS FOR 'STYLE.'

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DEMETRIUS περὶ Ἑρμηνείας.)

THE best-known Greek word for 'style' is, of course, λέξις; and the best-known Greek treatment of the subject of style is that (in the Third Book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) which is introduced by the words: περὶ δὲ τῆς λέξεως ἐχόμενόν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἀποχρῆν τὸ ἔχειν ἂν δεῖ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη καὶ

ταῦτα ὡς δεῖ εἰπεῖν, καὶ συμβάλλεται πολλὰ πρὸς τὸ φανῆναι ποιόν τινα τὸν λόγον (Aristot. *Rhet.* iii. 1, 2). The term λέξις was used in the same sense by Aristotle's successor, Theophrastus, who wrote a treatise περὶ Λέξεως. This work of Theophrastus was one of considerable influence; and could it

be recovered, it would probably be found to throw great light upon the divisions of style current among the later rhetoricians, who often refer to it.

Besides λέξις there are other words for 'style,' all of which, however, appear to be post-Aristotelian in this sense. One of these words is φράσις. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus λέξις and φράσις are used side by side, while in the *de Sublimitate* (c. 30) τὸ φραστικὸν μέρος = ὁ λεκτικὸς τόπος, and in Marcellinus (*Vit. Thucyd.* § 39) φραστικοὶ χαρακτήρες = οἱ τῆς λέξεως χαρακτήρες. Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* viii. 1, 1: cp. x. 1, 87) has φράσις in this sense, and Diog. Laert. (*Vit. Philo.* viii. 57) has: ἐν δὲ τῷ περὶ ποιητῶν φησιν ('Αριστοτέλης) ὅτι καὶ 'Ομηρικὸς ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ δεινὸς περὶ τὴν φράσιν γέγονε, μεταφορικὸς τ' ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς περὶ ποιητικὴν ἐπιτεύγμασι χρώμενος. If this last is an exact quotation and Diogenes has not substituted a term of his own day for τὴν λέξιν in the original text of Aristotle, then we have here an instance of the use by Aristotle of the word φράσις, which does not (I think) occur elsewhere in his extant writings. Possibly a less formal word than λέξις was judged more appropriate in reference to an early writer like Empedocles. The same use of φράσις by Aristotle is implied by Diogenes (V. 38) when he says with regard to Theophrastus: τοῦτον Τύρταμον λεγόμενον Θεόφραστον διὰ τὸ τῆς φράσεως θεσπέσιον Ἀριστοτέλης μετωνόμασεν, and by Strabo (*Geograph.* xiii. 2) in his corresponding account of the change of name: Τύρταμος δ' ἐκαλεῖτο ἔμπροσθεν ὁ Θεόφραστος, μετωνόμασε δ' αὐτὸν Ἀριστοτέλης Θεόφραστον, ἅμα μὲν φεύγων τὴν τοῦ προτέρου ὀνόματος κακοφώνιαν, ἅμα δὲ τὸν τῆς φράσεως αὐτοῦ ζῆλον ἐπισημαινόμενος.

ἀπαγγελία, properly used of narrative and especially of historical narrative, is another late word for 'style' in general. Examples will be found in Dionys. Hal. *Vet. Cens.* ii. 4 (τῶν φιλοσόφων δ' ἀναγνωστέον τοὺς τε Πυθαγορικοὺς τῆς σεμνότητος καὶ τῶν ἡθῶν καὶ τῶν δογμάτων ἕνεκεν οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας); in Plut. *de Audiendo* 45 (καὶ γὰρ ὁ Πλάτων τὸν Λυσίων λόγον οὔτε κατὰ τὴν εὐρεσιν ἐπαίνων, καὶ τῆς ἀταξίας αἰτιώμενος, ὁμως αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν ἐπαινεί, καὶ ὅτι τῶν ὀνομάτων σαφῶς καὶ στρογγύλως ἕκαστον ἀποτετόρνευται: cp. *Vit. Demosth.* c. 2); and in the sixth chapter of the *Ars Rhetorica* once attributed to Dionysius.

In addition to the three terms already given, γραφή and διάλεκτος are occasionally found in contexts where they may conveniently be translated 'style,' though neither

of these words can be regarded as being, in the full sense here intended, an accepted term of rhetoric. There remains, however, the word ἑρμηνεία, whose meaning in the title of the treatise bearing the name of Demetrius it is the principal object of this paper to elucidate. As the superscription in its full form (Δημητρίου Φαληρέως περὶ ἑρμηνείας ὁ ἔστι περὶ φράσεως) is of more than doubtful authenticity, it is better not to lay any stress on the testimony it affords to the convertibility of φράσις and ἑρμηνεία. Internal evidence, even apart from the usage of other writers, is enough to show that ἑρμηνεία is used in the sense of the Aristotelian λέξις. The word occurs some score of times in the *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, but two or three illustrations of its meaning will suffice. We should, for example, do well to compare § 136 νῦν καὶ τοὺς τόπους παραδείξομεν ἐφ' ὧν αἱ χάριτες πρώτους δὲ τοὺς τῆς λέξεως with § 156 αἱ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν χάριτες τοσαῦται καὶ οἱ τόποι. The first of these quotations introduces, and the second closes, one and the same discussion: so that ἑρμηνεία is clearly regarded as tallying with λέξις. Similarly ἡ ἑρμηνεία ἢ πρὶν ('the antique style') in § 14 seems to correspond to λέξις as characterised in *Aristot. Rhet.* iii. 9, 1, 2. Again, in § 35 οἱ χαρακτήρες τῆς ἑρμηνείας answers to the phrase more usual in other writers, οἱ χαρακτήρες τῆς λέξεως. In general it may here be remarked that, though the four 'types of style' discussed by Demetrius are not mentioned by Aristotle, yet the contents of the *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* present many points of close contact with the Third Book of the *Rhetoric*.

It is not, however, the case that Demetrius is alone in his use of ἑρμηνεία. Far from it. Even Aristotle himself, though his accepted word for 'style' is λέξις, shows how easily the general sense of 'expression' might pass into that of 'formal literary expression.' In the *Poetics* 1450 b we read: λέγω δέ, ὥσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται, λέξιν εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἑρμηνείαν, ὃ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμμέτρων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων ἔχει τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν, while in the *Topics* 139 b we have: ἔστι δὲ τοῦ μὴ καλῶς μέρη δύο, ἐν μὲν τὸ ἀσαφὲς τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ κεχρησθαι· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ὀριζόμενον ὡς ἐνδέχεται σαφεστάτῃ τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ κεχρησθαι, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ γνωρίσαι χάριν ἀποδίδεται ὁ ὀρισμός. At the same time it is easy to see the divergent meanings borne by ἑρμηνεία in the short logical treatise (of Aristotelian origin) entitled *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* and in the *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* attributed to Demetrius. As Ammonius, the son of Hermias, says in his commentary on the Aristotelian treatise: Οὐ γὰρ δὴ καὶ

αὐτὸς (ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης) καθάπερ Δημήτριος τὸ περὶ λογογραφικῆς ἰδέας βιβλίον συγγράψας, καὶ οὗτος αὐτὸ ἐπιγράψας περὶ Ἑρμηνείας ἀξιοῖ καλεῖν ἐρμηνείαν τὴν λογογραφικὴν ἰδέαν, ὡς δὴ περὶ ταύτης ἐν τῷ προκειμένῳ βιβλίῳ διαλεξόμενος . . . διὰ τοῦτο ἐπέγραψε τὸ βιβλίον περὶ Ἑρμηνείας, ὡς οὐδὲν διαφέρον ἢ οὕτως ἐπιγράψαι ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀποφαντικοῦ λόγου (Berlin Aristotle iv. 96 b, 97 a).

In the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, now commonly attributed to Anaximenes, approximations to the later use are furnished by such phrases as καλλίστην ποιῶν τὴν ἐρμηνείαν (*Rhet. ad Alex.* 1435a 3) and τῆς ἐρμηνείας τὴν σύνθεσιν (*ib.* 1436a 21). In this work the term is used with special reference to *composition*, while in other writers (such as Philodemus) it seems to be applied particularly to *diction*. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus it is clear that by ἐρμηνεία is meant ὁ λεκτικὸς τόπος as opposed to ὁ πραγματικὸς τόπος,—the whole department of style as opposed to the whole department of invention. The following passage of the *de Compositione* is decisive on the point: τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς λέξεις φιλότιμον καὶ φιλόκαλον καὶ ταῖς νεαραῖς πέφυκε συνανθεῖν οὐχ ἥττον ἡλικίας ἐπιτόηται γὰρ ἅπασα νέου ψυχῇ περὶ τὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὠραϊσμόν (*Dionys. Hal. de Comp. Verb.* c. 1). Here ὁ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ὠραϊσμός signifies nothing more or less than *elegance of style*. Instances as unequivocal will be found in Dionys. Hal. *de Comp.* c. 3 (τί οὖν λείπεται μὴ οὐχὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ κάλλους τῆς ἐρμηνείας αἰτιάσθαι); *de Thucyd.* c. 51, *Ep. ad Pomp.* c. 5, *de Lys.* cc. 2, 5, 10, 24; in the *περὶ Ὑψους* c. 5 (τὰ κάλλη τῆς ἐρμηνείας), c. 43 (τῆς ἐρμηνείας . . . αἰσχρῇ), c. 23 (τὰ ἐρμηνευτικά); in Diog. Laert. *Vit. Philos.* ii. 57 (ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Ἀττικῇ Μοῦσα γλυκύτητι τῆς ἐρμηνείας); in Philo (e.g. Cohn and Wendland ed. min. I. p. 196, *de Cherubim*: ῥητορικὴ δὲ τὰς τε ἐκάστοις δεινότητας ἐξετάζονσα καὶ πᾶσιν τὴν πρέπονσαν ἐρμηνείαν ἐφαρμοζούσα); and in other late writers.

To make the statement complete, it should be stated quite explicitly that Demetrius employs other words besides ἐρμηνεία in the sense of 'style' or 'artistic writing.' He uses λέξις side by side with ἐρμηνεία throughout (e.g. §§ 114, 133) his treatise. φράσις and ἀπαγγελία are also found in his book, but only (I think) in what are, or seem to be, quotations from other writers. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, also, uses (e.g. *de Isocr.* c. 3, *Vett. Cens.* I. c. 4) λέξις, ἐρμηνεία, φράσις and ἀπαγγελία indifferently.

The question may possibly be raised why the author of the *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* should have given (if it was he who gave) his book

this title rather than that of *περὶ Λέξεως*. One of the reasons may have been the desire to distinguish it from the Third Book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and from the *περὶ Λέξεως* of Theophrastus. In the body of his treatise, as in the critical writings of Dionysius, it is clear that mere considerations of variety often determine the use of one expression rather than the other. It was perhaps also a point in favour of ἐρμηνεία, as against λέξις, that the latter sometimes stands for 'diction,' in the more restricted sense of the word. But I would suggest that probably the chief ground for this preference of ἐρμηνεία to λέξις was that the former had, and the latter had not, a corresponding verb. λέγειν might, no doubt, be employed; indeed, the author of the *Rhet. ad Alex.* (c. 25) uses εἰς δύο ἐρμηνεύειν and εἰς δύο λέγειν synonymously in describing bimembral periods. But such a use is hardly free from ambiguity, as Aristotle apparently recognises when in the *Soph. El.* c. 4 he employs the periphrasis τῇ λέξει σημαίνειν as an equivalent of ἐρμηνεύειν. In English we have no verb corresponding to the noun 'style' (in the sense of 'artistic writing'); and consequently we must have recourse to some such circumlocution as 'to write artistically,' if we wish to render ἐρμηνεύειν as employed by the Greek rhetoricians. Sometimes, it is true, the verb 'to phrase' might serve. For example, in the *περὶ Ἑρμ.* § 46 it would be possible to translate εἰ δὴ τις οὕτω μεταβαλὼν ἐρμηνεύσειν αὐτὸ by 'if we change the phrasing of the sentence.' But in general ἐρμηνεύειν will be rendered 'to express artistically' or 'to write in good style,' while such a phrase as ὁ δαιμόνιος ἐρμηνεύσαι Πλάτων (*Dionys. Hal. de adm. vi dic. in Dem.*, c. 26) will be translated 'Plato with his marvellous gifts of style.' It may be that φράσις and ἀπαγγελία (no less than λέξις) were hampered as stylistic terms by the want of convenient verbs to correspond to them. φράζειν and ἐκφράζειν are but seldom found in this sense, and the common meaning of ἀπαγγέλλειν is 'to relate an occurrence' or 'to deliver a speech.'

The natural Latin rendering of *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* is *de Elocutione*, as was seen by Petrus Victorius, a scholar remarkable for the pains he took to discover the best Latin equivalents for the Greek rhetorical terms. *Elocutio* is defined by Cicero (*de Inv.* I. 7) as 'idoneorum verborum et sententiarum ad inventionem accommodatio'; and Quintilian *Inst. Or.* viii. 1, 1) says 'igitur, quam Graeci φράσιν vocant, Latine dicimus elocutionem.'

Other Latin words would also serve (e.g. some of those given in Quintil. ix. 1, 17); but among these we can hardly include *interpretatio* (though the treatise is still often described as the *de Interpretatione*), since that term implies rather the explanation of words (especially strange or foreign words) than the expression of one's ideas. Whether appropriately used or not in the Latin translation of the Aristotelian *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, the word 'interpretatio' can scarcely be used to translate the Demetrian *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*.

On *Elocution* would also be the natural English rendering if we could venture to revive a use now obsolete,¹—if we could say with Bacon 'a strange thing that that part of an orator which is but superficial and rather the virtue of a player, should be placed [sc. by Demosthenes] so high above those other noble parts, of invention, elocution, and the rest; nay almost alone, as if it were all in all.' The accomplishment thus preferred by Demosthenes to 'invention and elocution' was, of course, *actio* which suggests rather our modern ideas of 'elocution.' Rejecting 'elocution,' we may try 'expression.' But this word, when used in reference to literature, more naturally bears the sense given to it by (say) Mr. Beeching in his recent Clark lecture on 'Expression in Poetry.' No doubt we may add a defining epithet and speak of 'rhetorical expression,' thus making it clear that spoken prose is primarily meant by all these late Greek literary critics. But two words are then used to translate one; and if this is not necessary (as our leading English authorities tacitly assume) in the case of the *λέξις* of the Third Book of the *Rhetoric*, neither is it necessary in the case of the *ἑρμηνεία* of the *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*. For the one term as for the other the best available brief rendering is the word *style*, which is recommended by its respectable French and Latin pedigree, as well as by its suggestion of a personality behind the pen. DEMETRIUS ON STYLE would, therefore, seem to be the most convenient English title to give to the treatise.

The treatise itself deserves, it may here be briefly added, more attention than it has so far received. The text requires careful

revision, and the readings of P 1741 should be reported more fully and more accurately than hitherto. For the approximate determination of the date of the book a thorough examination of its contents is necessary. Not only do definite allusions show that the work taken as a whole belongs to a time much later than that of Demetrius Phalereus, but the character of its grammar and vocabulary supports a like inference. The book embodies to a large extent the traditional Peripatetic teaching of many generations; and its natural place in the long historical development of the Greek theory of prose style (in which development it marks, among extant works, a distinct stage) would seem to be the period between Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the rhetorician Hermogenes. Where so much is uncertain, it would be rash indeed to make any positive statement; but from the imperfect evidence before us we might surmise that the treatise belongs to the latter half of the first century A.D. Whether it was written by Demetrius, and by what Demetrius, we cannot say. We have, however, already seen—incidentally—that it is apparently mentioned by Ammonius (circ. 500 A.D.) and by him linked with the name Demetrius.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

I take the opportunity, afforded by the correction of the proof-sheet of this paper, to refer to Mr. Adam's 'Emendation of Eurip. Frag. 222' on p. 197 of last month's *Classical Review*. The emendation seems (if one may be allowed to say so) a distinctly happy one, and may perhaps be held to derive some additional support from the fact that P 2036 gives *εἶλε* in full. It looks as if the scribe had omitted the following *εἶλε* as an idle repetition. I had noticed long ago, and with great regret, the misprint on p. 146 of my *Longinus*. Not being satisfied with Valckenaer's *ταῦρος*, I marked the three lines (which are of course written continuously in P) to be printed thus: *εἰ δὲ που τύχοι | πέρη εἰλῆς * * εἶλε' ὁμοῦ λαβὼν | γυναικα πέρηνδρὸν μεταλλάσσων ἀεὶ*. By one of those accidents for which an editor has himself chiefly to blame the line assumed its present unmetrical form. The shortening of the final syllable of *εἶλε* never occurred to me as a possibility, and I cannot trace in my edition (the second) of Nauck the passage in which, as Mr. Adam states, mention is made of attempts to justify so unlikely a licence. May I at the same time be permitted to make a correction on p. 130 of *Longinus on the Sublime*, where an emendation of Dr. Postgate's is wrongly given in the critical footnote as *ῥῥῥ* instead of *ῥῥῥ*!

W. R. R.

¹ Obsolete in English, but not so in French. Littré, '*elocution* est quelquefois synonyme de *style*'; cp. *elocuzione* in Italian.

Καθέδρα AND. συμφέλλιον IN HERMAE PASTOR.

HERMAS used to be reckoned one of the Apostolic Fathers, with Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, and 'Barnabas.' His work, the *Pastor*, was perhaps written about 150 A.D., and not (as has been thought) some half century earlier. It purports to be his record of revelations made to him, but is probably an allegorical fiction, like the *Pilgrim's Progress* with which it has been compared, the name Hermas itself being possibly fictitious. In parts the *Pastor* is like a Christian version of *Cebetis Tabula*, on which Dr. J. M. Cotterill some years ago gave reasons to think that it was founded. The Sphinx and her riddle, for example, are mentioned in the introductory part of the *Tabula*, and her riddle read backwards seems to underlie *Vis. i.-iii.* of Hermas.

1. In his introductory *Visions* the author of *Hermas Pastor* makes the Church personified sit first alone on a chair (καθέδρα), and afterwards with 'Hermas' on a bench (συμφέλλιον). In his *Mand. xi.* a solitary pseudoprophētēs sits on the chair, and men who are πιστοί sit together on the bench. In the *Visions* he partially describes the chair and the bench, laying stress upon the fact that the bench has four feet, and leaving us to conjecture how many the chair has and what the number connotes. The following passages of the *Pastor* are taken from Dr. Harmer's text (1891).

Vis. i. 2. 2 βλέπω κατέναντί μου καθέδραν λευκήν ἐξ ἑρίων χιονίνων γεγονυῖαν μεγάλην· καὶ ἦλθεν γυνὴ πρεσβυτίς ἐν ἱματισμῷ λαμπροτάτῳ, ἔχουσα βιβλίον εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ἐκάθισεν μόνη, καὶ ἀσπάζεται με· Ἑρμᾶ, χαῖρε.

Vis. i. 4. 1 Ὅτε οὖν... ἡγήθη ἀπὸ τῆς καθέδρας, ἦλθαν τέσσαρες νεανῖαι καὶ ἦσαν τὴν καθέδραν καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολήν. 3 δύο τινὲς ἄνδρες ἐφάνησαν καὶ ἦσαν αὐτὴν τῶν ἀγκώνων καὶ ἀπῆλθαν, ὅπου καὶ ἡ καθέδρα, πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολήν.

Vis. ii. 4. 1 Τὴν πρεσβυτέρα, παρ' ἧς ἔλαβες τὸ βιβλίδιον, τίνα δοκεῖς εἶναι; ἐγὼ φημι· Τὴν Σίβυλλαν. Πλανᾶσαι, φησὶν, οὐκ ἔστιν. Τίς οὖν ἐστίν; φημί. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία, φησὶν. εἰπον αὐτῷ· Διατί οὖν πρεσβυτέρα; Ὅτι, φησὶν, πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη διὰ τοῦτο πρεσβυτέρα, καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη.

Vis. iii. 1. 4 καὶ βλέπω συμφέλλιον κείμενον ἐλεφάντινον κ.τ.λ. 7 καὶ ἄγει με πρὸς τὸ συμφέλλιον, καὶ... 8 μόνων ἡμῶν γεγονότων λέγει μου· Κάθισον ὦδε. λέγω αὐτῇ· Κυρία, ἄφες τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους πρῶτον καθίσαι.

Vis. iii. 2. 4 καὶ ἐγείρει με καὶ καθίζει ἐπὶ τὸ

συμφέλλιον ἐξ εὐωνύμων· ἐκαθέζετο δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ ἐκ δεξιῶν.

Vis. iii. 10. 1 καὶ ἀπῆνεγκαν αὐτὴν πρὸς τὸν πύργον, καὶ ἄλλοι τέσσαρες ἦσαν τὸ συμφέλλιον... 3 ὥσθθι δέ μοι, ἀδελφοί, τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ὁράσει τῇ περὶ τὴν λίαν πρεσβυτέρα καὶ ἐν καθέδρᾳ καθημένη. 4 τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ ὁράσει τὴν μὲν ὄψιν νεωτέρα, τὴν δὲ σάρκα καὶ τὰς τρίχας πρεσβυτέρα, καὶ ἐστηκυῖα μοι ἐλάλει. Ἰλαρωτέρα δὲ ἦν ἢ τὸ πρότερον. 5 τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ ὁράσει ὅλη νεωτέρα καὶ κάλλι ἐκπρεπεστάτη, μόνας δὲ τὰς τρίχας πρεσβυτέρα εἶχεν· ἰλαρὰ δὲ εἰς τέλος ἦν καὶ ἐπὶ συμφέλλιον καθημένη.

Vis. iii. 11. 1 Ἄκουε, φησὶν, περὶ τῶν τριῶν μορφῶν ὧν ἐπιζητεῖς. 2 τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ὁράσει διατί πρεσβυτέρα ὥσθθι σοι καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδραν καθημένη; ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἤδη μεμαρασμένον κ.τ.λ. 3 ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, μήκετι ἐλπῖδα τοῦ ἀνανεώσαι, οὐδὲν ἄλλο προσδοκῶσιν εἰ μὴ τὴν κοίμησιν αὐτῶν, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς... 4 Διατί οὖν ἐν καθέδρᾳ ἐκάθητο, ἦβελον γινώσκει, κύριε. Ὅτι πᾶς ἀσθενὴς εἰς καθέδραν καθέζεται διὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν αὐτοῦ, ἵνα συνκρατηθῇ ἡ ἀσθενεία τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.

Vis. iii. 13. 1 Τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ ὁράσει εἶδες αὐτὴν νεωτέρα καὶ καλὴν καὶ ἰλαρὰν... 3 καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ συμφέλλιον εἶδες καθημένην, ἰσχυρὰ ἡ θέσις· ὅτι τέσσαρες πόδας ἔχει τὸ συμφέλλιον καὶ ἰσχυρῶς ἔστηκε· καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατεῖται. 4 οἱ οὖν μετανοήσαντες ὁλοτελῶς νέοι ἔσονται καὶ τεθμελιωμένοι.

Mand. xi. 1 Ἐδειξέ μοι ἐπὶ συμφέλλιον καθήμενους ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἕτερον ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ καθέδραν. καὶ λέγει μοι· Βλέπεις τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ συμφέλλιον καθήμενους; Βλέπω, φημί, κύριε. Οὗτοι, φησὶ, πιστοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τὴν καθέδραν pseudoprophētēs ἐστίν κ.τ.λ. 2 οὗτοι οὖν οἱ δάψυχοι ὡς ἐπὶ μάγον (αἱ μάντιν) ἔρχονται, κ.τ.λ.

2. Hermas has been credited with extreme simplicity and ineptitude. In *Vis. iii. 1. 8* he tells us that he is left alone with Ecclesia. Then she bids him sit down, and he replies, Κυρία, ἄφες τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους πρῶτον καθίσαι. 'Sed nullus presbyter adest.' One commentator would therefore rewrite his reply. Another says, 'Nihil muto: versus enim hic melius alio scriptoris miseram scribendi artem indicat.' A third thinks that 'Hermas laicus [presbyteros] etiam absentes reveretur': he shows his respect for the presbyters by refusing to sit down before them, although there are none present. But if he is unwilling to sit down first when only two are present, what can he mean but

that he would have the other person present, the γυνή πρεσβύτες or πρεσβυτέρα, sit down before him? Accordingly, instead of saying, 'Old lady, sit thou down first,' he replies to the effect, 'Seniores priores.'

On *Vis.* iii. 11. 2 ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτερον κ.τ.λ. it is remarked, 'prorsus aliter *Vis.* ii. 4. 1,' with reference to πρεσβυτέρα... 'Ὅτι πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη. Here again, I think, *Hermas* is neither careless nor forgetful, but deliberately makes one symbol serve two purposes. In *Vis.* ii. the Church is made to be primeval and pre-existent like Wisdom in Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, with allusion perhaps for the epithet 'elder' to Philo's *Leg. Allegor.* ii. 1 ὁ δὲ θεὸς πρεσβύτερος κόσμον καὶ δημιουργός. In *Vis.* iii. the same epithet is explained as representing decay in the Church of the present. In like manner the writer makes καθέδρα as a symbol serve two purposes.

3. 'Συμφέλια, τά, the Lat. *subsellia*, Byz.; *συνέλλια* (*sic*) in Anth. P. append. 385: in sing. *Hermog.* (L & S). Anth. Χαίρετ' Ἀριστέιδον τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπὶ μαθηταί, | τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι, καὶ τρία συνέλλια. Note sing. *συνφέλλιον* (-έλιον) also in *Hermas Pastor*. In rabbinic Hebrew the word is read *safsaf*. *Hermas* makes a parable of his contrast between the chair and the bench; and so Plutarch contrasts καθέδρα with κλίνη and gives an application to the ψυχή in *Quaest. Conviv.* vii. 10 Ὅθεν ὥσπερ ἡ κλίνη τοῖς πίνουσι τῆς καθέδρας ἀμείνων, ὅτι τὸ σῶμα κατέχει καὶ ἀπολύει κινήσεως ἀπάσης, οὕτως ἔχειν ἀτρέμα τὴν ψυχὴν ἄριστον.

A chair might have four feet or three. The chair in *Hermas*, being contrasted with the bench which is expressly said to have four feet, is evidently meant to have three only. With this agrees the symbolism of other parts of the *Pastor*, in which squareness is an attribute of what is perfect of its kind and ἀνευ ψόγου. As the Church in her perfection rests upon τέσσαρας πόδας, so in the two buildings of the tower, which is again the Church, whatever is perfect is τετράγωνος. Thus in *Vis.* iii. the tower is built ἐν τετραγώνῳ and λίθοις τετραγώνους λαμπροῖς (2. 4-5), which represent apostles and others οἱ πορευθέντες κατὰ τὴν σεμνότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ (5. 1), and stones of another shape have to be cut and squared before they can be εὐχρηστοί (6. 6). In *Sim.* ix. the foundation rock, which is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, is τετράγωνος (2. 1, 12. 1), and all the stones of the tower are again τετράγωνοι (3. 3, 6. 7-8, 9.

2). The tower standing on the square rock corresponds to the Church on her square seat, the bench.

4. A chair with three feet suits the contexts of καθέδρα in the *Pastor*, and it appears that two things are there signified by its tripod-form.

The word καθέδρα is used of a station for observing omens in Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* ii. 5 ὅτι καθέδρα μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ στάσις ἀρίστη τῶν οἰωνοῖς μαντειομένων ἢ βλέπονσα πρὸς ἀνατολάς. For the 'tripod' compare Eurip. *Ion* 91 f. θάσσει δὲ γυνὴ τρίποδα ζάθεον | Δελφίς ἀείδουσα, and the ancient myth in Plato *Legg.* iv. (719 c) ὅτι ποιητὴς ὅπταν ἐν τῷ τρίποδι τῆς Μούσης καθίσταται τότε οὐκ ἔμφρων ἐστίν. The false prophet sits on his tripod in *Mand.* xi. 1-2, and the δῖψυχοι come to him as a soothsayer. These μαντεύονται ὡς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη, and the devil πληροῖ αὐτὸν τῷ αὐτοῦ πνεύματι (3-4). As the Church and the faithful on the bench in *Vis.* iii. 13 and *Mand.* xi. correspond, so the chair of the Church in *Vis.* i. 2 corresponds to the chair of the heathenish false prophet in *Mand.* xi. Aged and sitting on a tripod, book in hand, she looks like the Sibyl, for whom *Hermas* mistakes her. That he does so is stated only in *Vis.* ii., but with reference also to *Vis.* i., for it is only in the first vision that she is λίαν πρεσβυτέρα (*Vis.* iii. 10. 3).

The Church in the chair is old and decrepit, to signify ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἤδη μεμαρασμένον (*Vis.* iii. 11. 2). The chair with three feet represents this also, in accordance with Hes. *Op.* 531 f. τότε δὴ τρίποδι βροτῶ ἴσοι | . . . φοιτῶσιν, and Aesch. *Ag.* 79 f. φυλλάδος ἤδη | κατακαρφομένης τρίποδας μὲν ὁδοῖς | στείχει. The allusion by *Hermas* to the riddle of the Sphinx, which is now apparent, is completed by *Vis.* iii. 12. 1 Τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ ὁράσει εἶδες αὐτὴν ἐστηκυῖαν καὶ τὴν ὅψιν νεωτέραν ἔχουσαν κ.τ.λ. Tracing the three ages of man backwards, with reference to the new birth, he represents the Church as first old and then younger and again younger, as she rests upon three and two and four feet respectively.

Hermas Pastor was the subject of two papers read to the Cambridge Philological Society in the session of last year. These notes are in substance the first paper. The second consisted of extracts from the article on *Hermas* and *Cebes* at the end of vol. 27 of the *Journal of Philology*.

C. TAYLOR.

CAMBRIDGE, 1901.

ON THE ENIGMA IN VERGIL, *ECL.* III. 104.

- D. Dic quibus in terris—et eris mihi magnus Apollo—
 tris pateat caeli spatium non amplius ulnas.
 M. Dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum
 nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto.

No satisfactory interpretation, as far as I know, has been offered for the former couplet. The traditional explanation, that a hoax was intended, is not probable in itself, and, if true, then by the laws of amoebean verses there should have been another hoax, to cap it, in the next couplet. All solutions connected with the notion of a grave or a pit leave *quibus in terris* without meaning. This indeed might not in itself be a fatal objection, but surely graves are not openings in the spacious vault of heaven, but in solid earth.

Perhaps a clue to the meaning may be found in Herodotus iv. 158, where the Greek wanderers in Libya are brought at last to a well of Apollo and recommended to settle there, *ἐνθαῦτα γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τέτρηται* 'for here there is a hole in the sky,' or a window in heaven. The *χάλκεος οὐρανὸς* was supposed to be pierced with holes, through which rain fell. If a country like Egypt or Ethiopia had no rain, it was because there were no windows. If in certain favoured parts of such countries the blessing of rain was occasionally granted, it was because there was a small window there. The existence of oases in the desert was well known, and this passage in Herodotus appears to

show that the cause of them was supposed to be not merely the existence of a well, but also of a window. Vergil had not travelled like Herodotus and seen things for himself, but he had read about them and meditated on them and formed his own ideas. It is not at all surprising that he should have made a country bumpkin like Damoetas express the slightness of the rainfall in terms of the size of the window, fixing with rustic particularity upon precisely three ells as the *maximum* for each opening. If Damoetas had been asked to account for the intermittent character of the rainfall, he might perhaps have been content with the naive simplicity of Strepsiades

καίτοι πρότερον τὸν Δι' ἀληθῶς ὤμην διὰ κοσκίνου οὐραίν.—Ar. *Nubes*, 372.

It may be objected that the verb *τετραίνω* in Herodotus may easily describe a number of small perforations like the holes in the rose of a watering can, through which rain can pour *guttatim*, whereas Vergil's *pateat* suggests rather an open window through which it would rush in a deluge, as indeed is the case in Genesis vii. 11, where the metaphor of a window in heaven occurs. It may be enough to reply that if Vergil's language had been perfect, we should not have been puzzling over it after the lapse of nineteen centuries. Possibly the fact that in Egypt and Libya the open windows of the harem are regularly fitted with lattice work containing minute perforations may help to justify the word.

ARTHUR WRIGHT.

ON THE EPISTOLA SAPPHUS.

Of the two MSS. of the *Ep. Sapph.* here collated, the first is in the Corsini Library in Rome 43. F. 5, the same MS which I have described in the *Journal of Philology* for 1887 pp. 153 *sqq.* and given a complete collation of its readings in the *Culex* in Vol. vi. pp. 203, 4 of this *Review*. I call it here II.

The second MS belongs to the D'Orville collection in the Bodleian, no. 166 = 17044 in Madan's *Summary Catalogue* (vol. iv. p. 78). It is a small thin MS containing

fol. 1–47 Tibullus, fol. 48 Sappho vatis Elsie (Lesbie) Mitilene ad Phaonem Siculum amatorem. On p. lviii. it is said to be drawn ex antiquissimo manuscripto.

The Corsini MS belongs to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century: the D'Orville MS seems to be not earlier than the middle of the fifteenth century. I call it here D'O.

Both MSS I have collated with Sedlmayer's edition of the *Heroides* Vienna 1886.

1. Ecquid ubi II Nunquid ubi *with al.*

ecquid in marg. D'O littera II D'O 3
 aitoris II saphos II D'O 4 mouetur (e in
 rasur.) D'O 5 requiris II requiris changed
 to requires D'O 6 sim II D'O 7 elegi

flebile II ellegi flebile D'O 8 barbitos II
 barbiton D'O 11 thyphoydos ethne II
 tiphydos etne D'O 12 premit marg. al.
 tenet II tenet D'O 13 Nec ego marg. al.
 mihi II iungam quae D'O 14 uacue II
 15 Nec mihi pyerides (pi. D'O) subeunt
 naiadesque puellae II D'O, nisi quod driades-
 que est in D'O, litteris dr super rasuram
 16 Nec michi al. me II tespiadum D'O 17
 amatorie II amatorie D'O cidro II clio D'O
 18 athays II athois D'O ut om. II D'O 19

alias al. alie II quas hic II D'O 20 abes
 D'O 21 luxibus II 24 bachus II 25
 phebus dannem II 26 illa uel illa II D'O
 29 aleus II D'O 30 quanuis II grandius
 om. in textu, habet in marg. II 32 rependo
 II D'O Post 32 II et D'O habent Nec me
 dispicias (desp. D'O) si sum (sim D'O) tibi

corpore parua Mensuram (-que D'O) breuis
 nominis ipsa fero / parui (in marg. II).¹ 35
 zepheya II 36 Andromade II D'O 39 te/
 D'O una littera erasa 41 At mea cum
 legeres II D'O 45 Hoc quoque II Me quo-
 que D'O 46 tunc II D'O 47 Tunc II D'O
 49 Et quod II At que ubi amorum D'O sed
 post amorum additum est iam supra uersum
 manu, ut uidetur, recentiore 50 langor
 II D'O 51 Sicilides II 52 sicilis II
 53 At uos erronem tellure remittite nostrum
 II D'O sed in II caronem suprasr. 54
 Nasiades—nasiadesque II Nis.—nis. D'O
 57 que immites II, et sic D'O sed ut
 uix dispiciatur 61 leta II 63 inops II
 D'O uictus (uinctus D'O) meretricis amore
 II D'O 65 cerula D'O 66 querit II 67
 monuit D'O 69 Et tanquam desint que
 (-ae D'O) me sine fine fatigent II D'O 70
 curas D'O penas II 71 querelis II D'O 76
 arabum II arabo D'O dona al. rore II rore
 D'O olet al. habet II olet D'O 79 leuibus
 cor est II D'O 82 Nec al. et II Nec (in Et
 mutatum) D'O 83 artesque magistras II
 D'O 84 talya II 85 etas II 89 phebe II
 91 celum II eburno II D'O 93 etas II 94
 eui II 95 Nunc II 96 sed ut amare sinas
 II D'O 97 abortis II D'O 98 sit quam in
 hoc D'O 100 modo II 101 summa tulisti
 II D'O 102 fuit D'O 103 nec te om. II
 habet D'O 104 Admouit quod tu II ad-
 mouit quod tu D'O 109 nescio quis II
 111 deerant II D'O 112 Astriectum II

¹ The verses found in f sum breuis at nomen quod
 terras impleant omnes Et mihi. mensuram nominis
 ipsa fero are not in II or D'O.

D'O 113 Postquam se dolor inuenit II D'O
 tunc pectora planxi II mea p. planxi D'O
 116 extructos II D'O 117 merore II
 merore D'O cauaxus II caraxis D'O 125
 Illi^e (* fortasse recentiore) D'O Illic II 127
 Sepe II 128 Sepe II 130 consueneras al.
 consueras D'O 132 Elloquor D'O 133
 ulterius pudet hic narare (narrare D'O) II
 D'O 134 sine te al. tecum II 137 tan-
 quam II 138 delitiis II meis al. tuis II 139
 en io al. hericto II ericto D'O 140 Attulit

II D'O iactante marg. / attende metrum II
 141 toffo II 142 migdonii II D'O 145 silue
 (-uae D'O) dominumque meumque II D'O
 146 Ville D'O 147 cespitis II 150 Grata
 al. illa II conbibit D'O illa II herba D'O
 152 "dulce" nullae D'O 153 prius II D'O
 154 Concidit II hysmarium D'O dauLias D'O
 (L super rasuram) clauianis II ythim II ithim
 D'O 155 ythim II saphos II D'O 156 ut
 II D'O 157 uitro—amnis II uitro^eoque (sic)—
 amne D'O magis om. D'O sed additum
 est in marg. 159 Quem super hunc II
 Quem super hunc D'O 160 cespite II 162
 Formosus puer est uisus adesse michi (michi
 D'O) II D'O 163 quo nunc non ignibus
 equis II cur nunc non i. aquis D'O 164
 brachiis add. in marg. am D'O ambrachiis II
 tibi est II D'O 165 Phebus II equos II 166
 Acteum D'O sed mutato quod prius fuerat,
 credo Actiacum Retheum II 167 pyre II
 pirae D'O 168 illeso II D'O 169 uersus
 amor fugit letissima pyre II iussus a. tetigit
 laetissima pirae D'O 171 altum D'O 173
 luce al. uoce II 174 lac. grauidae D'O grauide
 lac. II 175 nymphe II 177 quam nunc
 leuis II quam nunc erit D'O 179 pennas II
 et sic D'O sed ut uidetur i super rasuram
 181 chelim II D'O 182 erit II D'O 183
 posuit D'O poetica sapho II poetica saphos
 D'O 185 Cur michi et acthiacas II Cur
 tamen acciacas D'O 188 Et forme (-ae
 D'O) meritis II D'O 181 ferotior D'O ulla
 II D'O 190 morior II moriar D'O 191 Ah
 quantum II Ha quam^{to} (sic) D'O pectora
 D'O corpora II 192 Quam poterant saxis
 II D'O 193 phao II 194 Visa om. que
 D'O m. pr. 195 forent II D'O 196 sub-
 sii^t t D'O 199 nuptura et nuptaque proles
 II nupturaque nupta p. D'O 200 eolia II
 201 infamen II amare II D'O 203 nobis II
 204 quem D'O pene II 205 reddeat D'O 207
 Hecquid ego precibus pectusne II E e quid

ego an precibus pectus marg. ne D'O 209
 tua uerba referrent II tua uella r. D'O 210
 Nec te D'O docebat D'O 211 pupisque
 (puppi^eque D'O) tua uotia paramus II D'O
 212 laceras II D'O 213 prestat II amanti

D'O super rasuram eunti II saphon II *D'O*
218 Non II *D'O* 219 O saltem II *D'O*
misere *D'O* sed ut post re rasura sit

saphos poetissa, ad phaonem amasium suum
epistolam hanc II Finis. Hec epistola fuit
per Ovidium de greco in latinum translata
D'O magnis litteris miniatis.

An examination of these variants leaves
no doubt as to the comparative value of the
two MSS. II is much superior to *D'O*. I
will select the more prominent instances in
which II seems to throw new light on the
still obscure question of the inter-relation
of the MSS, and especially of the position
of the *Francofurtanus*, which Palmer has
followed implicitly, often, as I think, to the
rejection of something more probable.

1. *Ecquid ubi* II, and so Trist. v. 2. 1
where Owen shows that *ubi* not *ut* is the
reading to which MSS preferably point. *f*
(*Francf.*) has *Ecquid ut*.

7. *elegi flebile carmen* II and *D'O*, but the
latter *ellegi: elegi quoque* of *f* has every
mark of interpolation. Ehwald makes
elegi perf. of *eligo*: surely this is impos-
sible.

8. *barbitos* II. The Greek form is clearly
pointed to.

12. *premit* II with *tenet* in the margin.
premit is also found in Laur. 91. 28 (de
Vries). It is less commonplace, and as the
first reading of II, cannot lightly be rejected.
Francf. (f) has *tenet*.

15. II is here on a level with most of the
MSS: all are alike corrupt. *f* alone has
what seems indubitably right *Nec me pyrri-
ades methynniadesue*. But this cannot
prove that *f* is to be followed implicitly
in every one of its readings in *Ep. Sapph.*
Anactorie indeed, for which II gives *amatorie*
is proved to be right by Maximus Tyrius
24. 8; *Cydro* is confirmed by *Cidro* of II;
but this does not prove *quas non sine
crimine amavi* of *f* to be right against *quas
hic s. c. amavi* of most MSS including II
D'O. It is true, *hic* must be wrong, for
Sappho goes on to say *infamem quae me fecistis
amatæ*; but *nec* (Bentley and Burmann)
would readily account for *hic*, and is more
than probable: *non* has much the look of
an interpolation.

32. *repēdō* II *D'O* with all MSS includ-
ing *Francf.* Bentley changed this to *repēde*:
but, before this can safely be done, the *Ep.*
Sapph. must be proved to be Ovid's. Palmer's
examples especially A. A. 2. 677 *Illae
munditiis annorum damna repēdunt* support
repēdo, I think, rather than *repēde*.

After 32, II with almost all MSS gives
these two verses.

*Nec me dispicias si sum tibi corpore parua
Mensuramq brevis nominis ipsa fero*

That they are an interpolation of the same
kind as the two verses after Ib. 130, *Finiet
illa dies quae te mihi subtrahet olim*, *Finiet
illa dies quae mihi tarda uenit*, seems to me,
spite of Bährens and de Vries, certain.
Just as in the *Ibis* *quae mihi sera uenit* of
the real distich reappears in the altered
form *quae mihi tarda uenit* of the interpola-
tion, so in the true distich of *Ep. Sapph.*
(preserved by *f* and Harl. 2499), the words
mensuram nominis ipsa fero form the sub-
stratum of the interpolated pentameter.
And just as in the *Ibis* the excellent Gale
MS (*G*)¹ has preserved the interpolated
distich without the true one, so in the *Ep.*
Sapph. the interpolation has ousted the true
reading from nearly all the MSS.

II contains two signs of something wrong,
dispicias for *despicias*, and *mensuram* for
mensuramque, of most MSS.

53. Both II and *D'O* give

At uos erroneam tellure remittite nostrum

except that II has *caronem* written over
erronem. *Francf.* gives *O uos*: other MSS
Nec uos, *Ne uos*, *Ne uos*. All alike seem
wrong.

nostrum must, I think, be genuine, 'my
runaway,' a natural description of the
absentee Phaon. *At* may be a misreading
of *Ac* = *Hac*. Sappho has just said

Quid mihi cum Lesbō? Sicelis esse uolo,

and to Sicily she would allude in *Hac tellure*.
It is not likely that *tellure* by itself should
= 'your land,' any more than that *iugera*
should mean *whole acres* in Aetn. 80.

Here again I more than suspect *f* of a
wrong reading. *O uos* is strange, and
leaves *tellure* unaccounted for.

54. II's *nasiades* seems to be right for
nisiades of most MSS including *f*. It would
be identical with *nasiades*, found in two of
de Vries' MSS: both refer to *Syracuse*: but
the more correct name is the Doric form
Nasos, which with *s* doubled occurs as *nassos*
several times in the eighth century cod.
Puteaneus of Liv. xxv. 30 (*American Journal
of Philology* for 1892, pp. 345, 6, where I
have tried to show that *Nisiades* is wrong).

57. *quae montes celebras Erycina Sicanos*
is supported by *f* and four others of
de Vries' MSS against *quae immites*
c. *E. S.* of the rest. Which is right?
I think the latter, which is more parti-

¹ Prof. Nettleship and Dr. Hilberg both thought
G the best MS of the *Ibis*.

cular and into which *montes* could hardly have been altered; and which has a special force in a passage where the poet is speaking of the *cruelty* of love. Heinsius cites Stat. Theb. xii. 155 *innites citius Busiridos aras Odrysique famem stabuli Siculosque licebit Exorare deos*: where Luctatius Placidus explains of the Sicilian Palici to whom human victims were at one time offered.

69, 70. *f* here has a reading which is found in it alone.

Et tamquam desit quae me hac sine cura
fatiget

Accumulat curas filia parua meas

and this is retained by Riese, Sedlmayer, and Palmer. If *curas* is in 70, *cura* in 69 can scarcely be right. There is however a v.l. given by II, *poenas*, and it is possible that this v.l. originally coexisted with *hac sine cura fatiget*, by which the tautology *cura, curas* was avoided.

Yet, on other grounds, is not *f*'s reading questionable? Grant that the elision *me hac*, or the post-position of *sine*, are not by themselves suspicious: in combination they are sufficiently harsh to make one pause. I rejoice to be here in accord with de Vries who follows the bulk of MSS in printing *Et t. desint quae me sine fine fatigent*.

76. Here again II is valuable in guiding us to the probable reading. It has

Non arabum noster ^{al. rore} dona capillus olet ^{al. habet}

while *D'O* has Non arabo noster rore capillus olet.

Of *arabo* in II there is no trace, and it is in itself improbable. The instances of *Arabus* quoted by Charisius 99 from Plautus Poen. 5. 4. 6, from the Bacchides, from Lucilius xxv. cannot be considered any real support of *Arabo* here. Nor is the passage he cites from a letter of C. Cassius to Dolabella *Arabi mirifico animo in nos fuerunt*, nor even Vergil's *Hyrcanis Arabisue* vii. 607 much in its favour: in each of them the plur. = the Arabians. Cir. 238 *Arabae Myrrhae* is different, and seems undoubted: and as the Ciris was probably written in the Augustan period, may fairly be appealed to as a support of *Arabo*.

Hitherto however *Arabum* rested on *f* alone: my collation of II (which like *f* has no trace of any v.l.) shows that a MS, which as we see from *Nasiades* has preserved the truth where most MSS have lost it, knows *Arabum* and only *Arabum* in the v. of the Ep. Sapph.

Further than this II does not lead us: it in no way decides between *dona—habet* and *rore—olet*; either would suit *Arabum*. Meanwhile however we have (1) the general use of the Roman poets, with whom this gen. plur. *Arabum* is much in favour, (2) the attestation of two MSS (*f* and II) quite independent of each other, but agreeing to present (though not always the same) particular variants not found elsewhere, in support of *arabum*.

79. *leuibus cor est* II with most MSS: *leuibusque est* (om. *cor*) *f*.

The two MSS taken together point to *leuibusque cor est*; and de Vries rightly argues from Pont. iii. 1. 32 *Confiteor misero molle cor esse mihi* in favour of this, which is the actual reading of two or three of Sedlmayer's MSS. I cannot agree with Palmer in preferring *leuibusque est cor*, improbable whether Ep. Sapph. is by Ovid or by an imitator of Ovid.

125. *Illi D'O* originally, 'has been superscribed later. This may be added to the instances of *illi = illic* collected in Noct. Manil. pp. 89, 90.

132. II's *uigilat* I believe to be right, *ora* is *hora*. It is the waking-time of my perceptions. As a lover I am all awake. Palmer felt the absurdity of the ordinary reading *uigilant sensibus ora meis*, as his note proves.

134. II's v.l. *sine te al. tecum*, may be an error for *al. mecum* 'I may not be alone.' Surely *f*'s *sicce* is wrong. It is a coarse touch with no warrant from the rest of the poem.

139. II here is valuable. It gives *en io* with *hericto* as a variant. *Enyo* is no doubt the right word, and has already been restored from *f*. Of *enyo* the *en io* of II, *enio* of de Vries' *m*₄ is simply a variation.

145. *Siluae dominumque meumque* II *D'O* with nearly all MSS. *f* and three other of de Vries' MSS give *dominum siluaeque meumque*.

I more than doubt this reading of *f*. With the position of *que* in the perfectly normal, but less commonplace, *siluae dominumque meumque*, compare Aetn. 600 *Haec uisenda putas terra dubiusque marique*, where in prose *dubius terraque marique* would be expected.

153. If *prius* is genuine, it must mean 'in former times,' 'in days of yore,' a reference to mythical legend: *non ulta* = that did not take a true revenge on her husband in cutting up and killing her son Itys.

156. Hand thought *Hactenus ut media cetera nocte tacent* meant 'so long until all

else is hushed.' The nightingale and Sappho sing till all else is silenced and they are heard alone in the midnight woods. This seems to me right; in Fast. 5. 661 *Hactenus ut uiuo subiit rorantia saxo Antra leues cursum sustinuitis aquae*, which Hand explains in the same way, it certainly seems impossible to give any meaning to the usual punctuation *Hactenus: ut*, for how could the waters of the Tiber stay their course when the river-god had retired to his cavern? It is just the reverse of the poet's meaning: the river stayed the course of its waters till such time when (*hactenus ut*) the god had retired, and then flowed on again.

159. The super hunc of II, super huc of D'O perhaps point to an original *superans* 'rising over which.'

164. *ambrachiis* might be an expansion of *ambrachis*, hardly, as Bährens thought, of *ambrachies*; nor does Heinsius' *Ambrachias* (nom. fem.) seem likely. *Ambrachiae* is the most accredited form of the genitive; I suspect that the final enlarged *e* of this as written in some early codex was supposed to mean *-is*. On this abbreviation see Reussen's new *Eléments de Paléographie* Louvain 1899.

169. The one point in this v. which appears to me certain is that it did not end with *mersi*, which is a distressing chime to *uersus*, and ignores the palpable antithesis of *Deucalion igne leuatus erat* in 170. As Deucalion's ardour subsides, *Pyrrha's* rises. Only a determination to follow *f* everywhere can blind criticism here. *Pyrrhae* is required by the obvious sense of the passage, and especially by *lentissima*.¹

This, I think, is one of the most important cases for estimating the value of *f*. If its reading is here *wrong*, as I believe it must be, it cannot be followed implicitly in other passages where, in consideration of its unique preservation of the uncorrupted truth in 15 and (I suppose) 162, some editors claim for it an almost superstitious reverence throughout the poem. It is with reluctance that I find myself at variance on this point with Palmer. With me are Bährens, de Vries, Riese, and partially Ehwald. I quote the opinion of Bährens in his Latin Epistula to Comparetti on the Epist. Sapph. p. 5 (1884). 'Est Francofurtanus, etsi omnium codicum integrorum (h.e. praeter excerpta) nunc antiquissimus nec bonis lectionibus destitutus, tamen

¹ *lentissima* (which must be right, not *laetissima*) of course refers to the indifference Pyrrha had hitherto shown to Deucalion's passion: with this *tegit* (not *figit*) suits very well.

haud raro ualde interpolatus et caute adhibendus.'

In the following two passages a comparison of *f* with II places the former at a disadvantage.

191, 2. At quanto melius tecum mea pectora iungi
Quam saxis poterant praecipitanda dari! *f*.

Ah quantum II iungi m.p. tecum II
Quam poterant saxis II.

193-6.

Haec sunt illa Phaon quae tu laudare solebas,

Visaque sunt totiens ingeniosa tibi.

Nunc uellem facunda forem! dolor artibus obstat

Ingeniumque meis substitit omne malis. (*Frankf.*)

195 forent II with D'O and most MSS.

A very clear case. The poet plays on the double meaning of *pectora*, 'bosom' 'seat of intellect,' and carries on the word as subject to *forent*. How tame compared with this is *forem*. It is obvious that *forem* is a mere mis-writing of *forent*.

In the two following, I do not think the case so convincingly in favour of *f* as Palmer, nor does de Vries, nor Ehwald.

207, 8.

Ecquid ago precibus, pectusque agreste mouetur?

An riget, et Zephyri uerba caduca ferunt? *f*.

II gives

Hec quid ego precibus, pectusne agreste mouetur?

D'O has

Ec quid ego an precibus pectus' agreste m. / ne

and almost all the MSS have *ego, pectusne*. In many *ego* is followed by *an* or *hec*, and there are not a few variations.

I think it not impossible that *ego* is right, and more than probable that *pectusne* should be retained. *Egō*, of course, could not have come from Ovid, scarcely even from an imitator; but the *an* or *hec* which in some MSS follows it seems to represent a real tradition of a word lost: possibly

Ecquid ego in precibus? pectusne agreste mouetur?

'Am I of any account in my course of entreaty? is that rude heart touched?' Have

I any power as a *suppliant*, if not as a lover?

213. Solue ratem. Venus orta mari mare
praestat amanti

So *f* and *D'O*, but *D'O* over an erasure. Most of the MSS have *eunti*. That this is right the similar *si pacem nullam pontus mihi*

praestet eunti (Pont. ii. 9, 27) makes more than probable. I cannot for a moment believe that *amanti* was altered after Pont. ii. 9, 27 to *eunti*, and that this alteration then spread into nearly all the MSS, expelling the original *amanti* (de Vries).

ROBINSON ELLIS.

THE NEW FRAGMENT OF JUVENAL.

(SEE *Classical Review* FOR 1899, MAY AND JUNE.)

THE criticisms of the fragment, known to me, which have appeared elsewhere than in the *Classical Review*, are the following.

P. von Winterfeld, Berl. Phil. Woch., June 24th 1899, pp. 793 sq.

S. Reinach, Revue Archéologique, Mai-Juin (i.e. the end of June or later) 1899, pp. 448-54.

P. Thomas, Bulletins de l'Académie royale de Belgique, July 7th 1899.

F. Buecheler, Rhein. Mus., July or August 1899, pp. 484-8.

M. Maas, Arch. f. Lat. Lex., October 1899, pp. 419-23.

P. von Winterfeld, Goett. Gel. Anz., November 1899, pp. 895-7.

F. Ramorino, Atene e Roma, February 1900, pp. 54-61.

R. Ellis, The new fragments of Juvenal, a lecture delivered February 5th 1901.

None of these writings makes any contribution to the explanation or emendation of the fragment; but Mr Winterfeld has some speculations about its history which are both interesting and probable, and Mr Maas originates one just remark which I will quote anon. Dr Jackson's evidently correct interpretation (C.R. November 1899, p. 401) of the shorter fragment '*mangonum pueros*' etc. was also proposed by Mr L. Havet in the Revue Arch. p. 449, '*les malheureux enfants rougissent des organes diminués qui leur restent.*'

2 *promittit omnia*. With this phrase and the contents of verses 5-6 and 14-16 compare Manetho iv 311.

6. It was suggested by Mr Owen and Dr Jackson (C.R. vol. xiii p. 267) that *Colocyntha* and *Chelidon* might be the names of cinaedi; and they quoted Sen. ep. 87 16 '*Chelidon, unus ex Cleopatrae molibus.*' This is nevertheless impossible for two reasons: firstly a *professus obscenum* is never

barbatus; secondly this context, with its reference to the defilement of drinking-vessels, requires the mention not of mere '*impudici*' but of those '*quorum oscula etiam impudici deuitant,*' like the Natalis of Seneca's next sentence or the Fabius Persicus of de ben. iv 30 2. The explanation of *barbata chelidon* which I gave in C.R. vol. xiii p. 266 is really the only explanation possible. That *colocyntha* must also mean *os impurum* is equally certain; but whether my account of the way in which it gets that meaning is right I am not so sure: if it ever meant *matella* (but there is nothing to show that it did¹) it might arrive by that route also at the sense required.

9-12 Write:

quid quod nec retia turpi <et>
iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem
munimenta umeri pulsata <hasta> inque
tridentem
qui nudus pugnare solet?

In June 1899 I rendered the MS reading of these verses thus, 'and similarly the retiarius' net is not kept along with his tunic, nor does he [put his] galerus in the same cupboard as his trident'; and this version is accepted by Messrs Maas and Ramorino. I said that the digression was absurdly frivolous: it is insufferably so. But the words as they stand are incapable of any other meaning. We may wish and

¹ Mr M. Maas writes in the Arch. f. Lat. Lex. vol. xi p. 419 '*colocyntha* = cucurbita sind nach Plinius xix 71 (ich verdanke W. v. Christ den Hinweis auf diese Stelle) in den Bädern wohl als pots de chambre benützt worden. Dann wäre colocyntha = matella.' Pliny says no such thing: his words are '*nuper in balnearum usus uenere urceolorum uice.*' *urceoli* are not *matellae*: Juvenal himself expressly distinguishes them, x 64, '*fiunt urceoli pelues sartago matellae.*' The household arrangements of Codrus, iii 203 sq., with '*urceoli sex, ornamentum abaci,*' must present a strange picture to the mind's eye of Mr Maas.

long (I take no count of renderings which are as frivolous in sense as my own and have the further disadvantage of being impossible), we may wish and long for the meaning 'retarii keep their arms and accoutrements separate from those of the retiarius who is *turpis*'; but it is not in the words. Consider: here are four articles mentioned, all belonging to retarii, qui nudi pugnare solent: *retia*, *tunica* (ii 143, viii 207), *munimenta umeri* (= *galerus*, viii 208, schol. 'galerus est umero impositus gladiatoris'), *tridens*. It is desired to say that the average retarii do not keep these articles in the same cupboard as does the infamous retiarius. This might be expressed by 'nec *retia* iunguntur *turpi* *reti*, nec *tunicae* *turpi* *tunicae*' etc. But how is it conceivable that the *tunica*, a garb common to both, should be here assigned to the *turpis* only, and that the average retarii should be said to set apart from the tunic of the infamous—not their own tunics, but—their nets and their shoulder-pieces and their tridents? That nets should be kept in one place and tunics in another is perfectly natural, and such a practice can imply no scorn of vice nor shrinking from contamination. I have now enabled the words to mean what they should mean by adding *et* at the end of 9: *et* rather than *aut*, because in 11 we have *que* and not *ue*. *tunicae* thus becomes nom. plur., and *turpi*, τῷ ἀρχῷ, stands for τοῖς τοῦ ἀρχῷ, just as *lanista* in 7 means *lares lanistae*. 'Nay more, the very nets and tunics are not suffered to touch the net and tunic of the infamous, nor do the bare fighters put shoulder-piece and trident in the same cupboard as does he . . . But your wife condemns you to share the same cup with fellows of his sort.'

11 *munimenta umeri pulsataque, arma, tridentem*. Neither in Latin nor in any other tongue that I know of does one add in apposition a generic term without an epithet, unless the term itself conveys information, as when geographers say 'Ticis flumen' to let you know what Ticis is. One says 'Cicero et Caluus, homines deserti,' but one does not say 'Cicero et Caluus, homines.' Lucretius indeed can write iii 371 'Democriti quod sancta uiri sententia ponit,' but that is because *uiri* means a right worthy man, like ἀνδρὺς in Soph. Ajax 817 and elsewhere. MSS contain solecisms of all sorts and therefore solecisms of this sort: 'formosae ueniant, chorus, heroinae' (read *formosus*), 'Lesbides...desinite ad citharas, turba, uenire meas' (read *mea*), 'croceae,

membrana, tabellae implentur (read *impletur*). Five hundred and ninety seven years ago was Francesco Petrarca born, and here am I explaining in a public print such things as these; for there are folks who do not know them. But in this verse, quite apart from the apposition, *pulsatam*, even if you correct its gender, is a ridiculous adjective to bestow on an offensive weapon. To account for the feminine inflexion in the MS I formerly proposed *ptusa hastamque*, choosing *ptusa* in order to confer some sort of point upon the lines as they then stood. Now, after emending verse 9, we can come nearer to the MS with *pulsata*. For *hastam tridentem* I quoted Val. Fl. i 641 *trifida... hasta*, but now I have the phrase itself, Prisc. GLK ii 343 16 'lectum est *tridentem hasta* et telo': Silius xvii 242 uses *telo tridentem*.

12-13. Another allusion to this consignment of disreputable characters to *pars ultima ludi* occurs in a corrupt passage of Seneca, nat. quaest. vii 31 3 'cotidie comminiscimur, per quae uiriliter fiat iniuria, ut traducatur, quia non potest exui: alius genitalia excidit, alius in *obscenam partem ludi* fugit et locatus ad mortem infame armatur.† egenus etiam in quo morbum suum exerceat legit.'

18 In this unexplained and seemingly inexplicable line we should perhaps read 'his (abl.) languentem animum *soluunt* (or *releuant*) et seria uitae.' Compare II. Lat. 685 'curasque animosque resoluunt.'

27 *aliis hunc mimum!* Pers. iii 30 'ad populum phaleras!' is a good parallel.

No one calls the fragment spurious but Mr Buecheler; and Mr Buecheler's judgment would carry more weight if he had shown himself able to correct or elucidate or even understand the verses on which he ventures to pronounce an opinion. But he could make neither head nor tail of them: he elicited no coherent sense from any six consecutive lines; and not having at hand the Classical Review for June 1899 he did not even discover that *pulsatam tridentem* was a false concord. One of his objections (p. 487) has no foundation except a strange misapprehension of his own, that 24 in *teneris haerebit dextera lumbis* (*ipsius* of course) has reference to 'Angriffe auf Knaben'; the faults he finds with 27 disappear when the punctuation is corrected; it is quite true that the apposition *arma* in 11 is 'sprachlich anstössig,' but it can no more have been written by this 'interpolator' (to call him so) than by the real Simon Pure. There remains only the

change from plural to singular at 20: this is certainly objectionable, but the objection comes ill from Mr Buecheler, whose own text of 'der echte Juvenal' contains many worse things.

Mr Owen (C.R. vol. xiii p. 267 a) thinks that our fragment, which stands in the MS after 365, should probably be placed after 345, instead of 346-8 which stand there now. I on the other hand agree with Mr Maas (p. 422) that 346-8 are themselves out of place, and that 349 ought to follow immediately upon 345. I will now explain what I suppose to be the fragment's relation to its context at 365, and what is the connexion between verses 1-29 and verses 30-34 of the fragment itself. When the old friends say 'pone seram, cohibe,' it is evident that they are not suggesting a remedy for the pernicious influence of the cinaedus described in 1-29: the cinaedus is 'uisceera domus,' and the more the wife is kept indoors the more will she be subject to his influence. On the contrary, the friends are suggesting a way to prevent the wife from gadding abroad to misconduct herself and squander her money on athletes (352-365); and what they suggest is a *custos*. Now a *custos*, for safety, would naturally be chosen from one or other of two classes, cinaedi or eunuchi. But Juvenal explains that neither class can really be trusted. The verses 1-29 are a *προκατάληψις*: they forestall the suggestion 'pone seram,' and they furnish the ground for Juvenal's reply 'quis custodiat ipsos custodes?': the cinaedi, whom one would choose as guardians, are in reality 'uiri' and are the wife's accomplices. Then at 366 he proceeds to the second class of *custodes*, the eunuchi, and shows that they too are practically 'uiri' and are accomplices also. The order of verses then should be this: 345, 349-365, frag. A 1-34, 366-373, frag. B, 374 sqq.

As to the present condition of 346-348, what has happened is pretty clear. Mr Winterfeld points out that both P and the Aarau relics have 29 lines to the page, that the archetype may have had the same, and that the first 29 verses of this fragment may have been one page of the archetype. The loss of this, with the verb *noui*, would leave an unconstruable verse 30, 'consilia et ueteres quaecumque monetis amici,' and our 346 'audio quid ueteres olim moneatis amici' appears to be a spirited emendation of this. The existing form of 348 I should explain by supposing that the scribe glanced from 'custo-des' in 32 to 'pru-dens' in 34, thus omitting 'qui nunc

...prudens' and leaving the defective verse

custodes et ab illis incipit uxor,

which was then completed by inserting 'cauta est.'

I agree then with Mr Owen that our fragment is not an alternative draft of 346-348. Elsewhere in Juvenal alternatives, whether Juvenal's or another's, can certainly be detected; and in this connexion I will try to clear up what Mr Buecheler calls the 'unbegreifliche Verse' preserved by Probus at vi 614. Our text runs thus:

hic magicos adfert cantus, hic Thessala
uendit 610
philtrea, quibus ualeat mentem uexare
mariti
et solea pulsare natis. quod desipis,
inde est,
inde animi caligo et magna obliuio
rerum,
quas modo gessisti. tamen hoc tolera-
bile, si non
et furere incipias, ut auunculus ille
Neronis, 615
cui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia
pulli
infudit.

'tamen hoc tolerabile si non semper aquam portas rimosa ad dolia, semper istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis, quo rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti. sed hi tres uersiculi in multis non sunt codicibus. quos in antiquissimo legimus codice et Probus etiam refert' Valla. The verses are still found in several MSS. They should be written thus:

tamen hoc tolerabile, si non
semper aquam portas rimosa ad dolia, semper
<peius>onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis,
quo rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti,
cui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia pulli
infudit.

'pei' has been absorbed by -per: this seems better than to retain *istud* and substitute *peius* for *ipsis*. 'Yet this is endurable, if one is not always carrying water to leaky jars, always lifting that burden, worse even than the urns of the Danaids, maddened by which you, Caligula, to whom Caesonia administered hippomanes, displayed the character of a Phalaris instead of a Roman monarch.' Some philtres cause merely stupor; but there is a worse sort, such as Caesonia gave Caligula (Suet. Gai. 50 creditur potionatus a Caesonia uxore ama-

torio quidem medicamento, sed quod in furorem uerterit), producing an endless recurrence of aphrodisiac excitement which is compared to the labour of the Danaids and leads to downright madness; and to this the poet traces the atrocities of Caligula's reign. The construction *Phalarim dedisti* is

the same as Ter. Ph. 476 'Phormio ... strenuum hominem prae-buit,' where C.F.W. Mueller in Dziatzko's edition cites many similar examples, such as Petr. 97 'ut saltem ostenderet fratrem.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WARS IN ARMENIA, A.D. 51—63.

III.—THE YEARS A.D. 61—63.

(With a Chronological Summary for all the Years A.D. 51—63).

IN contrast with the second period, this third and concluding period presents the curious difficulty, not of too few points of time marked in the Tacitean narrative, but of too many. And throughout, although different systems are presented, yet the arguments for or against their conclusions have not been set forth save very scantily by any writer. It is, therefore, my concluding task not only to discuss the conclusions, but also to invent the arguments for and against them.

A. Order of Events in Tacitus:—

The end of Book xiv. is concerned with events in Rome of the year A.D. 62.

- A. Book xv. opens with a continuation of the account of the Armenian wars and with the words

'*Interea rex Parthorum Vologeses*' etc.—xv. 1. 1.

viz.: Vologeses hesitates whether or no to interfere again in Armenian affairs, when he is roused to action by

- A'. Tigranes' invasion and devastation of Adiabene. Monobazus its satrap appeals for aid and Tiridates urges intervention.—1. 2-5.

- B. Vologeses' plan of campaign:—

- (a) Monaeses with the aid of Parthian cavalry and auxiliaries from Adiabene to invade Armenia and expel Tigranes thence.

- (b) He himself to threaten the Roman provinces.—2.

- C. Corbulo, hearing of these preparations, takes the following measures:

- (a) Two legions (IV. and XII.) under Verulanus and Vettius are despatched to assist Ti-

granes, but with secret orders not to be in a hurry to fight.

- (b) He had already written to Nero, requesting that a special commander should be sent out 'qui Armeniam defenderet,' as Syria through Vologeses' menaces was in greater peril, 'acriore in discrimine.'

- (c) The remaining legions (viz. III. VI. X.) are posted on the Euphrates: provincial militia are armed *en masse*: garrisons are placed at all the fords and the wells are guarded by forts, streams buried by sand, etc.—3.

- C' During these preparations Tigranes, anticipating a Parthian attack, threw himself into Tigranocerta.—4. 1. 2.

- D. Monaeses and the Parthians cut off a convoy and appear before the city. An attempt to storm it is repulsed with loss. Blockade of Tigranocerta.—4. 3-6.

- E. Corbulo hears of the siege of Tigranocerta and sends to Vologeses threatening an invasion of Mesopotamia unless the siege is raised. This message reaches Vologeses at Nisibis.—5. 1. 2.

- F. Vologeses, being in straits for fodder for his horses, owing to a recent locust storm, replies he will send envoys to Rome. Meanwhile he recalls Monaeses from the siege of Tigranocerta and himself retires.—5. 3-5.

- G. Tigranes quits Armenia.

[A discussion follows on the real significance of these Corbulo-Vologeses negotiations—in the course of which the question is raised 'Cur enim exercitum Romanum a Tigranocertis deductum? cur

deserta per otium quae bello defenderant? *An melius hibernavisse in extrema Cappadocia*, raptim erectis tuguriis, quam in sede regni modo retenti? Dilata prorsus arma, ut Vologeses cum alio quam cum Corbulone certaret, Corbulo merita tot per annos gloriae non ultra periculum faceret. Nam, ut rettuli, proprium ducem tuendae Armeniae poposcerat, et adventare Caesennius Paetus audiebatur.—(6. 2-4).

These questions imply necessarily past events. Hence we deduce the following :—]

- G'. The Roman army is withdrawn from Armenia and winters in hastily constructed quarters on the Cappadocian frontier.
Suspension of hostilities.
- H. Arrival of Paetus in Cappadocia. He is given Leg. IV. XII. and Leg. V. is summoned from Moesia. Local levies are ordered to assist him. Paetus declares he will annex Armenia as a province.—6. 5. 6.
- H'. 'Sub idem tempus' Vologeses' envoys return from Rome after a fruitless mission.
'Bellumque propalam sumptum a Parthis.'—7. 1.
- I. Paetus invades Armenia, despite unlucky omens, one of which was the escape of an intended victim from the winter quarters which were being built, but were yet unfinished :
'Hostiaque, quae muniebantur, hibernaculis adsistens, semifacta opera fuga perripit seque vallo extulit.'—7. 2-5.
- J. Paetus' expedition. He crosses Taurus 'reciperandis, ut ferebat, Tigranocertis vastandisque regionibus quas Corbulo integras omisisset.' Some forts are taken—capta quaedam castella—Paetus makes long marches—longinqua itinera—But he is forced to retreat 'instante iam hieme' back to his winter quarters.—8. 1-3.
- K. Paetus in winter quarters on the River Arsianias (at Rhandaia [Dio]). Many furloughs granted.—8. 3. 9. 2.
- K'. 'Interim' Corbulo strengthens his garrisons on the Euphrates and occupies strongly the hills on the farther bank, despite the presence in the vicinity of the enemy in large numbers.—9. 1. 2. Hence :
- L. Vologeses abandons his plan of invading Syria; and marches against Paetus, who is 'imminentium nescius.'—9. 2.
- M. Paetus in winter quarters hears of Vologeses' advance and seeks to concentrate his army.—9. 2.—10. 2.
- N. Paetus moves out to attack the enemy. A scouting party is cut off by the Parthians, whereupon he falls back again. But Vologeses not pressing the pursuit, Paetus divides his forces, posting 3000 men to guard the passes over Taurus where the enemy's approach was expected, cavalry in 'part of the plain,' and non-combatants with a military guard in the fort Arsamosata.—10. 2-6.
- N'. Paetus reluctantly sends to inform Corbulo of the approach of the enemy.—10. 7.
- O. Corbulo receives the message and does nothing save issue orders for a force of about 8000 men to get ready for a march.—10. 7. 8.
- O'. Parthian advance against Paetus. All Roman isolated detachments, etc., overcome. The main camp holds out.—11. 1. 2.
- P. Urgent message from Paetus to Corbulo praying for relief.—11. 3.
- Q. Corbulo leaving garrisons on the Euphrates makes forced marches day and night to relieve Paetus, while Vologeses presses the assault of the entrenchments.—12. 13.
- Q'. Negotiations of Paetus and Vologeses for surrender of the camp.—14.
- R. Roman evacuation of Rhandaia and retreat towards Cappadocia, Corbulo on the day of evacuation being within three days' march.—15-16. 2.
- S. Meeting of Corbulo and Paetus on the Euphrates. Corbulo refuses to invade Armenia again.—16. 3-17. 3.
- T. Corbulo returns to Syria. Paetus winters in Cappadocia.
'Exim Paetus per Cappadociam hibernavit.'—17. 3.
- U. Agreement between Corbulo and Vologeses (who has quitted Armenia). The former withdraws all his garrisons to the Roman side of the Euphrates: the latter all his garrisons from Armenia.—17. 4. 5.
- V. 'Veris principio,' A.D. 63. Arrival of Vologeses' envoys in Rome. The Parthian demands are rejected and Corbulo is appointed to sole command of the war. Cestius is sent to relieve

him of civil government of Syria and Paetus is recalled.—24. 1-25.

W. Corbulo concentrates a large army at Melitene.—26.

X. Corbulo invades Armenia by Lucullus' old route. Friendly reception of envoys from Vologeses and Tiridates, who are sent back with an escort and appeal for an agreement. Meanwhile Corbulo ravages the forts and lands of the hostile Armenian 'Megistanes'.—27.

Y. Meeting of Corbulo and Tiridates at Rhandaia. Tiridates agrees to go to Rome to do homage to Nero for the crown of Armenia.—28-30.

Z. End of the war. Tiridates before his Roman journey visits his brothers, Pacorus in Media, and Vologeses in Ecbatana.—31.

B. The Rival Schemes:—

Alike the beginning and the end of the chronology of these events admit of no dispute.

That xv. 1. 1. connects immediately with xiv. 26 is undoubted. Hence Tigranes' invasion of Media may be placed in 61 A.D., as xiv. 26 belongs, as we have seen, to A.D. 60. And although recounted amid events of A.D. 62, yet to ascribe this to the preceding year is justified by Tacitus' opening word 'Interea.' (A)

Thus A' = spring A.D. 61.

Again xv. 24. 1. (V.) is the 'beginning of spring,' A.D. 63. Thus

V-Z = events of A.D. 63.

This all being generally admitted there remain for the events A'-U but two campaigning years between which to divide them: viz.:

A.D. 61 ending in the winter of A.D. 61-62.

A.D. 62 " " " " A.D. 62-63.

Thus there are but two winters for which to make account.

The difficulty of the chronology of this period consists in the fact that we have three separate mentions of a winter in the Tacitean narrative A'-U; viz.:

- (1) That of G-G'. 'An melius hibernavisse' &c.
- (2) That of I-J. Paetus' 'hibernacula' and the 'instans iam hiems' which enforces his retreat.
- (3) That of T. 'Exim Paetus per Cappadociam hibernavit.'

It follows therefore that the second of these winters must be identical either with the first or with the third. And hence we have two rival arrangements of the chronology of these years according as the one or the other of these identifications is accepted.

I. EGLI. (P. 291-292).

Mommsen (*Hermes* IX. p. 136 N. + E.T. II. p. 58-60).

Tigranes' Incursion A' = spring A.D. 61.
Locust swarm in F = June-July A.D. 61.
Hence Parthian envoys absent on mission to Rome from July-Sept. A.D. 61.
Their return coincides with Paetus' arrival.
Hence Paetus' expedition I. = autumn A.D. 61.
And Paetus thus has to hasten his raid having but a short time.
Thus the winter of J = winter of G.

II. FURNEAUX (P. 115, N. 10).

Following Nipperdey. (Notes *ad locc.*)

G clearly implies that Corbulo's army had already passed the winter before Paetus' arrival. (Cf. *supra*—ad G.)
Thus the 'arma dilata' (G') = winter 61-62.
And Paetus arrives in spring A.D. 62: invades in summer: retires on approach of that winter.
Thus L-T all belong to the end of that same year A.D. 62—these events not implying long duration of time.
Thus the winter of J = the winter of T.

I.—SUMMARY II.

A.D. 61	A-K'	A-G'
61-62 winter	G. G'. + J. K.	G. G'
62	L-S	H-S
62-63 winter	T. U.	T. U. + J. K.
63	V-Z	V-Z

*C. Consideration of the Rival Schemes :—**I. The Egli Scheme :*

This scheme which identifies the winter which compelled Paetus' retreat with that of A.D. 61-62 involves more than one difficulty.

- (1) It leaves the passage in xv. 6. 2—the question asked 'An melius hibernavisse'—unexplained.

The locust swarm which partly compels Vologeses to enter into negotiations with Corbulo is dated in both schemes in the summer of A.D. 61. These negotiations result, as is necessarily implied in the passage xv. 6. 2-4, in the Roman evacuation of Armenia. (G.) We learn from this passage that this evacuation was a fact, and that hostilities were, as a fact, suspended. The past tense too of 'hibernavisse' cannot be disregarded. 'Why *had* the Roman army been withdrawn from Tigranocerta? Why *had* that been abandoned in peace which they had defended in war? Was it better to *have* wintered on the Cappadocian frontier...instead of in the capital of a realm just recovered? No! The reason for this suspension of hostilities was &c.'

This passage implies, not a question of future policy, but past facts now undergoing criticism.

It follows that the army evacuated Armenia and spent the winter in Cappadocia, while Vologeses sent his envoys to Rome. Corbulo, from whatever motive, was waiting for Paetus' arrival. Presently Paetus does arrive and makes his preparations; the Parthian envoys return; the war begins again. All this implies time spent, viz.: *after* the winter spent in Cappadocia.

But on this first scheme this winter is entirely disregarded. The negotiations are in the summer of 61: Paetus' arrival in the autumn. What has become of the winter which the Romans, after the negotiations but before Paetus' arrival, *had* spent on the Cappadocian frontier?

- (2) The scheme then continues to suppose that Paetus, after a hurried incursion, being forced to return to his

winter quarters by the approach of winter, stays in these undisturbed and is only attacked by the Parthians in the following spring, viz.: of 62 A.D. To this there are numerous objections:

- (a) The events allotted to A.D.

62 are insufficient and have to be spread very thinly over the months from spring to autumn, as Egli arranges them. Or rather, keeping more closely to the Tacitean narrative, we are left with an autumn on our hands barren of events. For the whole affair from the first advance against Paetus to the evacuation of Rhandaia and the meeting of Corbulo and Paetus a day or two later can hardly, at most, carry us from the spring of 62 A.D. further than July. After the meeting Paetus 'forthwith'—*exim* (T)—wintered in Cappadocia. What has become of the rest of the campaigning year?

This by itself is not a very forcible argument, inasmuch as Paetus is found proposing a renewed invasion of Armenia to Corbulo, as though time for this in that year still remained.

But on the other hand it is notable that the fact of the Roman evacuation of Armenia is not known in Rome itself till the early spring of A.D. 63 upon the arrival of Vologeses' envoys in the city (xv. 25. 1). It is true that a despatch from Paetus had arrived it seems in A.D. 62 (xv. 18. 1. 25. 1) which had concealed the fact of the evacuation. But if this, *ex. hyp.*, had been effected by July 62 A.D. it is well-nigh incredible that no news of it, if not from Corbulo, then from pri-

vate sources, had reached Rome six months later. Everything, again, in the narrative points to the fact that Paetus is attacked unawares when he thinks that the winter has closed all operations for the year (cf. xv. 9. 2): viz.: just after he has withdrawn to his winter quarters at the beginning of winter. Hence the news reaches Rome only at the beginning of spring. And Paetus' plans for a new invasion of Armenia must have been projected for the following year. This then is the winter of A.D. 62-63, the winter which drove Paetus to retire to those same winter quarters (J. K.). To suppose a Parthian attack in spring gives us far too much time.

- (b) Another sentence in the Tacitean narrative points to the supposition that the Parthian attack on Paetus occurs at the beginning of a winter, not at the opening of a fresh year's campaign.

Tacitus brings it as a charge against Paetus that he makes his raid into Armenia in a hurry 'necdum satis firmatis hibernaculis' (xv. 8. 1). It is to these unfinished entrenchments that he subsequently retires.

When he hears of the Parthians' approach he sallies out to meet them, declaring 'non fossam neque vallum sibi, sed corpora et arma in hostem data.' (xv. 10. 3).

This proud declaration on Paetus' part is not very probably a mere Tacitean invention. Accepting its genuineness, we remark that there is very great point in it if it be made by way of encouragement and ex-

planation by the general to troops who are looking gloomily and apprehensively upon entrenchments unfinished and fortifications begun and not completed. There is very much less point in the declaration if the general is sallying out of a camp where he has been quietly staying for six months, and whose fortifications, we must necessarily under these circumstances suppose, had been long since completed. 'Adversus urgentes casus' (xv. 10. 2) is a strange phrase to use of a Roman general and army under these conditions. But it is more justified if the army has but just returned to inadequate entrenchments and a large number of furloughs have just been given, while one entire legion has been sent off to winter elsewhere. If the Parthians find Paetus thus dismayed, and thus justifying a spurious confidence despite dismay, the probability again is strong that they descended upon him at winter's beginning, not in spring.

- (c) Further, during all Paetus' raid, meanwhile—'inter ea'—i.e. before the winter which sends him back, Corbulo has been guarding the Euphrates and, driving the enemy from the further bank, has seized and fortified it. It is because of this his rapid success that Vologeses changes his whole plan of operations and decides to fall on the unsuspecting Paetus.

It is not easy to suppose that an entire winter elapses between Corbulo's demonstration over the river and the Parthian

sudden descent upon Paetus which is the result of this demonstration.

All these considerations lead us to conclude that the Parthian attack on Paetus is made at the end and not at the beginning (as this first scheme supposes) of a year's campaign. If so, this must have been the year A.D. 62, as the news of its results is first surely known in Rome in A.D. 63. The Parthian attack is thus consequent upon his own raid into Armenia. This then must be placed in the autumn of A.D. 62. But to place the raid in the autumn of A.D. 61, and the retaliation in the spring of A.D. 62, as do Egli and Mommsen, runs counter alike to the Tacitean narrative and the probabilities of the case as deduced thence.

II. The *Furneaux-Nipperdey Scheme* :—

These two objections to the first scheme are serious, and are entirely avoided by the second scheme, which admits the wintering of the Roman army in Cappadocia in A.D. 61–62: places Paetus' arrival in A.D. 62: his raid in that year and the Parthian retaliation at the beginning of its winter.

To this second scheme it is also possible to make two objections :

- (1) Too many events are crowded into the early winter of A.D. 62. For ex. hyp. after Paetus has retired 'instante iam hieme' there occur in this same winter all the events M–S, viz. the Parthian advance, Paetus' concentration of troops; his march out against the foe, retirement, and new dispositions; the Parthian attack; siege of Rhandaia and its evacuation; and Corbulo's vain march to its relief.

Can, it may be asked, all these events take place after winter's pressure has been, if not already felt, yet immediately anticipated?

On the other hand it may be remarked :

- (a) That the question of supplies contributed to cause Paetus' withdrawal from his raid, as well as the approach of winter, and he thus may have retired to his winter quarters all the earlier.—xv. 8. 3.
- (b) The whole events M–S sketched above do not necessarily imply the duration of much time.

On the contrary the impression of the entire narrative is one of surprise and speed, with conflicting hopes and fears chasing one another in succession across Paetus' mind. Both the Parthians and Corbulo know there is no time to be wasted. Moreover the Parthians would prosecute a campaign in the beginning of winter with more readiness than the Romans.

This objection then is not very serious.

- (2) Paetus makes his raid into Armenia after he has at least begun to erect winter quarters. (I) Surely then, it is argued, this must have been in autumn. Now Paetus is in a great hurry to attack as soon as he arrives. He does not even wait for the arrival of one of his legions it seems, from Moesia (xv. 6. 5. compared with xv. 7. 2.). What then, on this theory, has become of the spring and summer of A.D. 62?

An answer to this objection is not difficult. We may suppose that Corbulo having requested in 61 A.D. the sending of a separate commander to Cappadocia, Paetus does not set out till the next year, and thus arrives only in the early summer of 62 A.D. Moreover, however eagerly he hurries his preparations on, these must none the less have consumed some little time.

But it is better to deny the inference from the erection of winter quarters that the Roman raid began only in autumn. Paetus' raid was not so brief an episode. There are forts taken, and 'long marches' made. Necessarily, too, he requires a fortified base of operations on which in case of need to retire, even though he starts from this in summer, and the more so as this itself is in hostile territory.

Because therefore he begins to fortify the position he chooses for this purpose before his raid, it by

no means follows that winter is not very far off.

In all probability Paetus arrives in the spring of A.D. 62 and sets out on his expedition in the summer, retiring again in late autumn. This objection also is of no great merit.

Note: Mommsen's View:

This can hardly be regarded as a separate objection to the second scheme, but must here be shortly noticed.

Mommsen, in *Hermes* ix. p. 136 Note, represents Paetus as actually taking Tigranocerta. This, he declares, is implied in Tacitus' words 'reciperandis Tigranocertis' and confirmed by Dio's words in lxii. 21, seeing that *in the next spring* Vologeses began with the siege of this city. The 'longinqua itinera' and apparent success of the expedition (the 'quasi confecto bello' of xv. 8. 3) coincide with this view.

This note of Mommsen's is misleading and by no means convincing. Dio's words are simply: 'ὁ Οὐολόγαισος τοῖς Τριγανόκερτοῖς προσέμειξε καὶ τὸν Παῖτον ἐπιβοηθήσαντα σφίσιν ἀπεώσατο.' There is no single word in Dio's narrative implying that Vologeses attacked the city in spring!

Did Paetus during his raid capture Tigranocerta? This is very improbable. Tacitus ascribes this to him as his professed object and then merely says that he took 'quaedam castella' before his retreat. Had he taken Tigranocerta, Tacitus is bound to have known the fact. Most certainly this large and strong city is not included in the 'quaedam castella' category.

Neither is its capture implied in Dio's words. For the Parthians under Monaeses had failed entirely in A.D. 61 to take the city. Naturally therefore, the town has to be dealt with by Vologeses on the next Parthian incursion thither in A.D. 62. Paetus sets out earlier to 'recover it,' i.e. throw anew a Roman garrison, such as had helped Tigranes there, into it. And on hearing of Vologeses' advance,

he naturally sets out to help the friendly city, but then retires again. But it is not improbable that Dio has simply confused Paetus' first raid and subsequent march out against Vologeses, so far as Tigranocerta is concerned.

I should then, as against Mommsen, declare that nothing at all in the Tacitus-Dio narrative warrants the conclusion either that:

(a) Paetus in his raid captured Tigranocerta.

or (b) Vologeses descended upon Armenia and Paetus in the spring.

D. Conclusion:—

Despite therefore the apparent weight of modern authority in favour of the first, the Egli scheme, I think that the second scheme is decisively preferable. This authority's weight is for the most part apparent only. Thus Schiller not only follows Egli with his customary fidelity, but, apparently for once conscious of the possibility of a different view, only fails entirely to understand what Nipperdey's proposed arrangement of these years really is. And Mommsen's hypotheses seem to me, for the reasons already given, not convincing.

Thus, looking at the two schemes side by side, it appears that the first runs counter to the Tacitus narrative, and the probabilities of the case in two great respects, from which blemishes the second is quite free. No really serious objection that I can discover or devise may be urged against the latter. And so far as the fair distribution of events between the two years A.D. 61-62 is concerned this again has the superiority.

Following Nipperdey, therefore, I propose this scheme for the most probable chronology of the years A.D. 61-63:—

A.—G'. A.D. 61	Tigranes' incursion into Adiabene. Monaeses' siege of him in Tigranocerta. Evacuation of Armenia by Romans and Parthians.
G. G'. winter 61-62.	Romans winter in Cappadocia.
H.—S. 62.	Paetus' arrival and raid. His withdrawal.

- Corbulo in Syria. The disaster of Rhandaia. Roman evacuation of Armenia.
- T.U. winter 62-63. Romans winter in Cappadocia and Syria.
- V.—Z. 63. Corbulo's invasion of Armenia. Agreement with Tiridates. End of the war.
- General Conclusion.*
- The result of the entire analysis of the years of the Armenian wars A.D. 51-63 is that I find myself unable to accept throughout the chronological arrangement proposed by any one modern writer or group of writers. Thus:—
- (1) For A.D. 51-54 it seems we must reject both Egli and Nipperdey-Furneaux, and devise another arrangement of our own.
 - (2) For A.D. 54-56 there is no controversy.
 - (3) For A.D. 57-60 we reject both Mommsen and Nipperdey-Furneaux, and follow, with some slight modifications, Egli.
 - (4) For A.D. 61-63 we reject Egli-Mommsen, and follow Nipperdey-Furneaux.
- The general chronological scheme then in brief will be as follows:—

ARMENIAN WARS: A.D. 51-63.

YEAR.	EVENTS.	TACITUS.
A.D. 51	Invasion of Armenia by Radamistus: Death of Mithradates. Radamistus on the throne.	xii. 44-48.
52	Invasion of Armenia by Vologeses: Flight of Radamistus. (Winter): withdrawal of Vologeses.	xii. 49. 50.
53	Return of Radamistus and harsh rule in Armenia.	xii. 50. 4.
54	Rising against Radamistus and his expulsion: Return of Tiridates. Preparations at Rome (winter).	xii. 50. 51. xiii. 6.
55	Revolt of Vardanes in Parthia. Vologeses evacuates Armenia. Arrival of Corbulo in Cappadocia. Agreement of Corbulo and Vologeses.	xiii. 7-9.
56) 57)	Tiridates in undisturbed possession of Armenia. Corbulo's preparations for war, and winter (57-58) under canvas in Armenia.	xiii. 34. 35. 36.
58	First campaign of Corbulo against Tiridates. Corbulo's two plans of action are neither very successful. (Winter): Fruitless negotiations with Tiridates. End of Vardanes' Revolt in Parthia.	xiii. 37. 38.
59	Second campaign of Corbulo and his third plan of action. Capture of Volandum and the forts. Surrender and destruction of Artaxata. March to Tigranocerta. Surrender of Tigranocerta (autumn). Storming of Legerda. (Winter): Corbulo in Tigranocerta.	xiii. 39-41. xiv. 23-25.
60	Tiridates' invasion of Armenia from Media. Corbulo compels his retreat and overruns Armenia again. Arrival of Tigranes and settlement of the country. Corbulo withdraws to Syria. (Winter): Corbulo in Syria: Tigranes in Armenia: Tiridates in Parthia.	xiv. 26.

YEAR.	EVENTS.	TACITUS
61	Tigranes' invasion of Adiabene. Monaeses' siege of him in Tigranocerta. Negotiations of Corbulo and Vologeses. Evacuation of Armenia by Romans and Parthians. Tigranes quits the country for good. (Winter): Romans in Cappadocia and Syria.	xv. 1-6.
62	Paetus' arrival in Cappadocia and raid into Armenia. Corbulo active on the Euphrates in Syria. Withdrawal of Paetus to Rhandaia. Parthian attack. The Disaster of Rhandaia. Roman evacuation of Armenia. (Winter): Romans in Cappadocia and Syria. Tiridates restored in Armenia. Parthian envoys go to Rome.	xv. 6-17.
63	Corbulo's invasion of Armenia. Conference at Rhandaia and agreement with Tiridates. End of the War.	xv. 24-31.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

Merton College, Oxford.

REVIEWS.

OSIANDER'S ROUTE OF HANNIBAL.

Der Hannibalweg. Von WILHELM OSIANDER.
Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
1900. Pp. 204. Price 8 Mk.

THIS is a treatise full of industry and abundant in citation of authorities; but it adds nothing of any importance to the controversy, and, it is to be feared, only tends to obscure the issue. There is in the whole book a want of logical argument and a failure to appreciate the real value of whatever evidence is brought forward at each step. In his conclusion Professor Osiander agrees with the view maintained, though not, I believe, in exactly the same form, by several previous writers—that the Mont Cenis was Hannibal's pass. This is a theory for which a good deal is to be said. The arguments against this pass are not nearly so strong as those against the Little St. Bernard. As I remarked in an article which appeared in the *Classical Review* in June 1899, the chief reason for rejecting the Cenis is that, if that route is chosen, all attempt to retain Livy's account must be abandoned. Some previous supporters of that route have said in effect, 'Well and good: Livy is a poor authority: throw him overboard.' Professor Osiander rightly declines to do this; rightly he recognises that, while Polybius is the chief authority, Livy comes next to him, and that it is our duty, if possible, to bring

both into line. But I venture to think that no judicious critic will approve of the expedient which he adopts to get over the difficulty.

Livy brings Hannibal to the Druentia; but the Druentia, now called the Durance, flows from Mont Genève and nowhere comes near the Cenis route. Well, then, says Professor Osiander, let us suppose that what Livy calls the Druentia was really the Drac and not the Durance. This theory was, I believe, invented by M. Larauza about eighty years ago, and was adopted by Mr. Ellis in 1854. Professor Osiander has resuscitated it; but the arguments by which he seeks to justify it are singularly weak and even misleading—Livy's Druentia must be an affluent of the Isère which borders the territory of the Vocontii, because Silius, who is 'the echo of Livy,' writes: 'Jam rura Vocontia carpit: Turbidus hic truncis saxisque Druentia, &c.' But Silius does not mention the Isère at all in this connexion, and clearly cannot be taken to mean anything more precise than that Hannibal came upon the Vocontii and afterwards reached the Druentia; 'for Livy, whom Silius 'echoes,' and who may be allowed to speak for himself, says 'per extremam oram Vocontiorum agri tendit in Tricorios, haud usquam impedita via priusquam ad Druentiam flumen pervenit.' It is obvious that, if the

Druentia was the Drac, Hannibal would have struck it before he reached the Tricorii; and it is rather surprising that Professor Osiander does not mention the Tricorii in this particular argument. The Drac, he continues, was called in the middle ages Drancus or Dracus—and so there is no reason why it should not have been called Druentia by Livy. It is hardly necessary to point out that the Druentia of Livy's contemporary Strabo is undoubtedly the Durance, and there is not the least probability that Livy would have ignored it in favour of the much smaller river Drac. It is curious how his confidence in this very arbitrary transference of names grows as he proceeds. It is put before us on page 74: at the top of page 100 the Drac is called 'Druentia-Drac, and by the time we reach the bottom of the same page it is 'Druentia' without further ceremony.

Of an entirely new argument in favour of the Mont Cenis route it is unnecessary to say much. Livy is speaking of the sights which inspired terror—the mountains, the snows, etc., and adds the words 'cetera visu quam dictu foediora.' These words, says Professor Osiander, must refer to the characteristics of the dwellers in the valley: it must, therefore, be a physical deformity: Desjardins states that goitre is worse in the Maurienne than anywhere else; therefore, Hannibal must have traversed the Maurienne, *i.e.*, he must have crossed the Cenis. It might be suggested that, whether or not most prevalent in the Cenis route, goitre is unfortunately prevalent enough in all the competing routes to strike the traveller with dismay. But it is really beside the question, since most readers of Livy would be as little prepared to connect the idea of physical deformity with the word *foedus* in this passage as in Sallust's words (about quite another region) 'loca tetra, inculta, foeda, formidolosa,' or with Livy's 'foedae tempestates.' The use, apparently in sober earnest, of such an argument surely weakens the case which it is desired to support.

There are many minute points of no real import on which the author dwells, as if they were a corroboration, in a manner which is rather irritating to the serious inquirer. A local road-surveyor remarked that the gorge near St. Jean de Maurienne was 'Hannibal's ravine.' 'So finden sich auch hier Lokaltraditionen über Hannibal, die jedoch nicht, wie die meisten ändern, an Reste von Kunstbauten, sondern an eine natürliche Schlucht anknüpfen.' What if the road-surveyor had got his 'local tradi-

tion' from an inquiring traveller, with 'Ball's Alpine Guide' in his hand? If Professor Osiander ever becomes a convert to the Traversette theory, he may be expected to produce with equal triumph the fact that an inn near Abries has the sign 'l'Éléphant.'

A great deal of course is made of the possibility of a view over the plain of the Po from the top of the pass, or rather from a point near it. This possibility he regards as a 'Kardinalpunkt.' Need we suppose more than that Hannibal pointed to a downward course—no more uphill path, but a valley leading to the plains? *Must* they actually see Lombardy? ἐνδεκνύμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ περὶ τὸν Πάδον πεδία . . . ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸν τῆς Ρώμης αὐτῆς τόπον ὑποδεκνύμενον (*Pol.* iii. 54); and if stress is laid on the compound prepositions, with the inference that the one participle is of things in sight, the other not, let me quote another passage from Polybius himself, 'καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς ὁράσεως εἰθίσμεθα συνεπιστρέφειν δὲ τὰ πρόσωτα πρὸς τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐνδείξιν ὑποδεκνύμενον' (*iii.* 38). In this passage both compounds are of something actually visible, and so we have no right in chapter 54 to make an arbitrary distinction. They could not actually see Rome; how can the Greek sentence prove that they did actually see the Lombard plain?

The route traced by Professor Osiander is familiar for the most part to all who have read Ellis or Professor Bonney or other advocates of the Cenis route. In one or two points he differs, not, as far as I can see, with any advantage. The beginning of the ascent is placed near Aiguebelle: the native town which Hannibal took is St. Jean; the white rock is l'Esseillon (too near St. Jean, I should have thought, for his purpose). But the chief novelty is that, whereas some Cenisians have fixed on the pass of the Cenis proper, and some on the Little Mont Cenis, Professor Osiander takes both at once. From arguments, which I do not quite follow, but which seem to be a misinterpretation of the very simple military narrative in *Pol.* iii. 53, 9, he deduces that Hannibal took part of his army up the Mont Cenis proper, and that the rest of his army went up the Little Mont Cenis, contriving to join the headquarters on the top of the main pass. The historical gain I do not perceive any more than the philological necessity; the controversial advantage is that the Cenis is the only competing pass which has two routes at all near one another separated by only a slight intervening ridge. On the improbability that the two portions

of the army would separate here for a time, or that, if they did, Polybius should not say so, it is needless to dwell.

The author does not bring fresh arguments of any weight against the Genève route. His strongest objection is to the 'beginning of the ascent' being placed at St. Bonnet. That view, which I upheld as correct, was originated, I think, by Létronne and adopted by Mr. Freshfield, whose arguments on that point I followed mainly in my article. I need not repeat them here. Professor Oslander says that if this is maintained, and Hannibal is taken over the Col Bayard into the Durance valley, he has a long descent to follow the beginning of his ἀναβολὴ πρὸς τὰς Ἀλπεύς, and then a fresh ascent to the final pass. This he calls 'ein Nonsens,' which M. Létronne and his followers may bear with all the greater equanimity because it happens that Mommsen is chargeable with just the same kind of 'nonsense' when he approves of the theory that Hannibal found his ἀναβολὴ at the Mont du Chat, which (according to that view) he crossed and then made a steep descent to the Lac de Bourget before he reascended towards the Little St. Bernard. In truth this difficulty is evidently born from a want of familiarity with mountain tracks. Those who have that familiarity need not be told how often the traveller ascends long distances only to descend and reascend. Would anyone who knew what he was talking about hesitate to say that he 'began his ascent' to Chamonix at Martigny le Bourg? Or if he were making for the Genève from Bourg d'Oisans would he object to the statement that he began his ascent to the Alps at the foot of the Col du Lautaret?

Another objection put forward is that if Hannibal had turned southwards from the Isère to reach the upper valley of the Durance, he would have played into the hands of the Romans because he would then give Scipio 'die beste Gelegenheit ihn zuvorzukommen und den Weg über die Alpen zu verlegen.' This is a very strange argument. How could the intelligence that Hannibal had turned up the valley of the Drac reach Scipio in time to make any interference in the Durance valley possible? Hannibal did not know that Scipio had given up all idea of cutting him off, and that neither he nor his army would have been found in the Rhone by any such message. But consider what he certainly did know. The distance from Vizille, where he found himself, to the point where he had left Scipio completely baffled, is more than twice the distance

which he himself would have to traverse before he reached the upper Durance, and he knew well enough that there could be no risk of any Roman force first receiving intelligence through Gallic messengers, and then marching up the 100 miles of the lower Durance valley to intercept him below Chorges. In fact he would have been over the Genève long before. Professor Oslander cites Niebuhr as saying that 'Hannibal would have done good service to the Romans by a march through the Durance valley.' There is no reference given, and I cannot find the passage. The context would probably show that Niebuhr was speaking of quite different circumstances. What Niebuhr does say, that is germane to this subject, is 'Had Scipio ventured to follow his enemy, Hannibal would certainly have defeated him, and Scipio would have been lost among the Gallic tribes.'

But when we come to another 'proof' the error is different. Zonaras (viii. 23) says that Hannibal from the Rhone passed by the shorter routes and took another way. These shorter routes, says Professor Oslander, must be the coast road and the Genève, therefore Hannibal did not take the Genève. The conclusion, if we make Zonaras an authority, is by no means this. When Hannibal had crossed the Rhone, his *shortest* route to reach the Genève was to follow the Durance all the way: he passed by the opening to this valley for reasons which are sufficiently indicated by Polybius and Livy. Zonaras does no more than echo Livy's 'non quia rector ad Alpes via esset.'

When Professor Oslander relies on minute examination of Greek or Latin words for his argument, I fear that he often goes wrong. In his twelve axioms he lays it down that the hill town (Livy's 'castellum, caput ejus regionis') of the first conflict must be on the same level, because Polybius says, 'εἰς τινα παρακειμένην πόλιν,' and *παρὰ* implies 'weder über noch unter, sondern auf gleichem Niveau.' Are there many Greek scholars who would assert that by *παρακειμένην* anything more than *neighbourhood* is implied? No less extravagant is the contention in another 'axiom' that when Polybius says that the Allobroges occupied places 'δι' ὧν εἶδε τοὺς περὶ Ἀντίβαν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀναβολήν,' we must exclude anything which is a pass over a ridge, because the preposition *διὰ* requires a 'Durchmarsch durch ein Engpass.' However, if he is to press the force of the preposition, he may be asked if every pass properly so-called is not a passage between two higher points.

Equally few scholars will agree with his view that the words 'incolunt prope Allobroges' mean that 'die Beiwohner sind nahezu (lauter) Allobroger'—a sort of adjectival force for the adverb, for which he seems to find support strangely enough in 'fere' (Hor. *Sat.* 1. 3. 96). Two pages further on he seems to think that the word *maxime* in 'Campestri maxime itinere ad Alpes pervenit' gives a superlative force to *campestri*.

It may be interesting for various reasons to examine two other contentions, though I confess I cannot see how on any grounds of ordinary logic they affect the question of Hannibal's route. Professor Osiander insists at considerable length that from Livy v. 34 we must conclude that the Celtic army under Bellovesus, which crossed the Alps early in the fourth century B.C., came over the Cenis and not over the Genève. I fail, as I have said, to see what his argument would gain by this, even if the facts were so. He lays down as an axiom that Hannibal's route must be one already opened by the Celts. That is true: but he extends this to postulate a route already opened by Celtic armies, which is not a necessary condition, and, more arbitrarily still, he claims that Roman writers must have known and recorded, every such ancient passage of a Celtic army. Obviously it was only necessary that Hannibal's guides should know of an existing practicable pass. But, apart from the futility of the argument, exception may be taken to his comments on the passage of Livy. He cites 'Ipsi (Galli) per Taurinos saltusque Juliae (altae) Alpīs transcenderunt.' He should have admitted that the text itself is much too uncertain to support any topographical theory; and it is curious that while he mentions various conjectures he takes no notice of Madvig's reading 'vallemque Duriae' which would indicate the Genève more clearly than the Cenis. I do not say that Madvig here is convincing, but he is not a man to pass over in silence anywhere. But, further, there are no valid arguments to show that if Julia, or Julia alta, is the true reading, it meant the Cenis—indeed Bellovesus seems to have been directing his march to the south of the Isère. (Has any emendator, I wonder, suggested Aptae Juliae?)

The discussion of the name Julia has a fatal attraction for our author, which brings me to a second contention with which I should be disposed to quarrel. He cites St. Odilo's Life of St. Maiolus, 'Ingens multitudo Saracenorum ab Hispania per Alpes Julias ad jugā Poeninarum Alpium

rapido cursu pervenit,' by way of showing that mediaeval writers called the Cenis 'Alpes Juliae.' The argument would be worthless as regards Hannibal's route; but, apart from that, his theory is extremely doubtful. St. Maiolus was captured by Saracens on Mons Jovis or Jovinus. There seems little reason to doubt that this means the Great St. Bernard. Dr. Dubi says it certainly does. Mr. Coolidge more cautiously says it probably does though it cannot be absolutely proved.¹ When a place is named, it may be assumed to be the place ordinarily so called unless there are circumstances which make that impossible or at least improbable. The name Alpes Juliae properly belongs to the Eastern Alps; the name Mons Jovis or Jovinus to the Great St. Bernard. As far as I can discover there is no reason why Professor Osiander should take Alpes Juliae to be the Cenis, or why (as he does on another page) he should suppose the 'Cenisstock' to be the Mons Jovis (the 'summum Jovis culmen' in Sil. iii. 510, which he erroneously quotes in support, clearly refers to Rome, not to the Alps). St. Maiolus journeying from Rome to Cluny might have crossed the Cenis but there is no reason to suppose that he did, or that he did not cross the Great St. Bernard. Indeed, the fact that the Maurienne had been overrun by the Saracens from Freinet (Fraxinetum) and the passes of the Graian and Cottian Alps held by them as early as 906 may of itself have induced the abbot of Cluny to choose a more easterly route in returning as well as in going. We know that he went to Rome by Chur. Why may we not suppose that the Mons Jovinus by which he returned is the Great St. Bernard? And, as we know further that the Saracens were overrunning the upper valley of the Rhine, east of Dissentis (which they did not touch) in 936, having obviously, as Mr. Coolidge points out, reached that district by eastern passes, there is no reason whatever to make the Alpes Juliae in this passage refer to the Cottian Alps.

The arguments about the other authorities which come later in the book are more connected with the subject, but need only a brief mention. I do not think that Professor Osiander's interpretation of the well known passages in Varro and Sallust will commend itself. To make Varro's order of passes agree with his theory he argues, as far as I understand, that Varro puts the Cenis instead of the Genève next to the Ligurian,

¹ In an article on The Saracens in the Alps, *Alpine Journal*, vol. ix. 254.

or coast road, because the Cenis is 'more easterly and therefore nearer Italy'; and for the same reason the Great St. Bernard (which he takes to be Hasdrubal's pass) is placed before the Little St. Bernard. A difficulty, no doubt, there is; but I still believe that it is met by the solution which I proposed in the *Classical Review*. However that may be, no one can approve the desperate expedient which is here proposed.

Professor Osiander deserves all credit for the industry and research of his treatise;

and it is all the more to be regretted that he leaves the controversy just where he found it. The impossibility of the Little St. Bernard was already demonstrated by arguments which needed no repetition. The Cenis route would have a fair case if it were not for the passage of the Druentia, and he certainly has not got rid of that difficulty. He has neither strengthened the case of the Cenis, nor weakened that of the Genève.

G. E. MARINDIN.

OSTHOFF'S SUPPLETIVWESEN D. INDOGERMANISCHEN SPRACHEN.

Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erweiterte akademische Rede von HERMANN OSTHOFF. Heidelberg, 1900. 4 M.

In this University address, delivered in a shorter form on the occasion of the birthday festival of the Grand Duke of Baden by Professor Osthoff in his capacity as Pro-rector of the University of Heidelberg, a very interesting problem is discussed, and one which lends itself, comparatively speaking, to popular treatment. It is in short an attempt to answer the question 'why do we say *am*, *was*, *been*, making one verb out of three, or again *good*, *better*, *best*; *bad*, *worse*, *worst* with the comparative and superlative from a stem different from that of the positive?'

The pamphlet of 95 pages falls into three parts. In the first, extending to page 40, the problem is propounded in all the varieties of form which it takes; in pages 41 to 52 will be found the solution; the remaining pages are occupied by references to the literature of the subject and by the index.

The problem itself is subdivided under five heads, according as it appears (1) in the verb, (2) in the formation of feminine words, (3) in the adjective, (4) in the numerals, (5) in the pronoun. In each and all of these there appear examples not a few where one or more alien stems have become part and parcel of a series of forms with which originally they had no connexion. In all cases it is noticeable that the words thus treated belong to the commonest elements of the language, and are those which are most frequently in use. In the verb system it is just the verbs expressing the most common actions which fall into this category; verbs of eating: *ἔδω* and *ἐσθίω*,

ἔδομαι but *ἔφαγον*; verbs of giving and bringing: *φέρω*, *fero*, but in Greek *οἶσω*, *ἡνεκα*, etc., in Latin *tuli*; verbs of going and coming: *έρχομαι* but *ἐλεύσομαι* and *ἔλθω*, *go* but *went*; *τρέχω* but *ἔδραμον*; verbs of saying and speaking: *ἐρῶ*, *εἶρηκα* but *εἶπον*; verbs of hitting: *ferio*¹ but *percussi*; verbs of seeing: *ὁράω* but, on the one hand, *ὄψομαι* and *ὄπωπα*, on the other, *εἶδον*, etc.

In the feminine formations it is remarkable that in the nearest relationships the feminine is rarely a derivative from the masculine form: *father*, *mother*; *husband*, *wife*; *son*, *daughter*. Only in Latin where the old words are lost do we find *filius* and *filia* from the same stem. More distant relationships like *grandson*, *grand-daughter* are expressed by forms from the same stem: *nepos*, *neptis*, for father-in-law, mother-in-law: *ἐκυρός*, *socer*; *ἐκυρά*, *socrus*. Yet son-in-law and daughter-in-law: *γαμβρός*, *gener*: *νύός*, *nurus* are from different stems. In the naming of the lower animals also the most familiar have names from different stems for the masculine and feminine forms: *horse*, *mare*; *bull*, *cow*; *boar*, *sow*, etc. Of wild quadrupeds only the deer, *hart* and *hind* are so distinguished in Old High German.

In the adjectival comparison it is noticeable that, in most languages, adjectives (and adverbs) expressing *good*, *bad*, *little*, fall into this category; in the numerals specially *one*, *first*; *two*, *second* and so in other languages. In the personal pronouns there are different stems for singular and plural; in the demonstratives, stems in the nominative different from the oblique cases, *ὁ*, *ἡ*: *τόν*, *τήν*, and so in the personal pronouns *ego*: *me*, etc.

¹ This verb, however, as distinguished from *verbero* is aoristic by nature and is explained by Plutarch as equivalent to *πληξαι* (*Romulus* 16).

Full details for the whole of the Indo-Germanic languages are given in the first part of the address to illustrate these headings. The explanation offered is briefly this: that, where interest is close and personal, the human mind individualises each detail, where the interest is more remote, it classifies in series. Hence therefore there are separate and individual forms for the actions of most frequent occurrence, for the nearest relationships and so forth. That

the explanation supplies a *vera causa* seems undeniable; whether, however, the cause supplied is the only cause is perhaps more doubtful. Be this as it may, the author has given us a most interesting study of a large number of seemingly isolated peculiarities which the ordinary grammar is content to label as irregularities, and has shown us that here as elsewhere there is a unity in things which at first sight appear exceedingly diverse.
P. GILES.

GILES' COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

A Manual of Comparative Philology. By P. GILES, Reader in Comparative Philology in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition, Revised. Pp. xl., 619. Macmillan, 1901. 14s.

A HEARTY welcome will be given to the new edition of a book which has long since established its position as an interesting introduction to a difficult subject and a valuable instrument of higher education. The main lines of the first edition are preserved, notably the frequent use of changes and idioms in modern English and its dialects to illustrate similar developments in ancient languages. The appeal from the unknown to the familiar is always refreshing, and is doubly so here, since even the facts of the history of our own language, particularly in Syntax, are still extremely difficult to find. The result is that even the special student of English Philology will probably find more help in Mr. Giles' lucid sketch of the general principles of the subject than in any of the professed handbooks of English Grammar; while the classical student, who is apt to feel that he has come into a rather arid region when he begins Philology and turns his back upon the wealth of literary association that surrounds even the linguistic part of his Classical training, discovers that the range within which he may find such interest has not been narrowed, but greatly extended, by the light which the historical method throws upon the modern literature and the everyday speech of his own and other countries.

To write a text-book on a subject so full of controversies and pitfalls is a feat rather like building one's own house, which, it is said, is generally much better done the second time than the first. Mr. Giles is

to be congratulated both upon the conspicuous success of his first attempt, which, besides other testimony to its value, earned the somewhat rare honour of a German translation, and upon the admirable use he has made of the present opportunity for improvement. One feels in turning over the pages that one is under the guidance of a scholar whose method of stating his subject has the freshness and precision whose value can only be learnt by constant experience in teaching it; and in the six years that have passed since the first edition the author has, perhaps insensibly, discarded what has been felt as its only real weakness, the ultra-sceptical, almost contemptuous tone which then appeared in his discussion of the more intricate points. *Tout savoir est tout pardonner*; in other words, the longer one works at difficult problems, in this subject at least, the more hopeful one grows of their ultimate solution and the more patient meanwhile of half-successful attempts to grapple with them. It is not that the present edition draws the reader into a larger number of unsolved questions than the first: indeed Mr. Giles' success in avoiding matters which are unprofitable to a beginner is quite as striking as before. But where important questions not yet finally determined have to be mentioned, they are now presented in a thoroughly spirited and hopeful tone from which the student can draw nothing but encouragement. The volume is slightly increased in size, but the change is more apparent than real, and due mainly to the use of larger type. The actual additions, besides a brief and welcome appendix with the text of the fragmentary "Forum Inscription," are generally put into footnotes, which often present in a very

happy form the fruit of the voluminous research of recent years; for example the note on page 260 gives all the main points of Wheeler's acute and convincing essay on the development of grammatical Gender (in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, 1899 (ii.) p. 528). And even this is not the most recent research which Mr. Giles has made accessible; light is thrown on many points from work only published last year, for example, on p. 520, the reader has the benefit of the results of Mr. Arthur Evans' most recent discoveries in Crete, bearing on the history of the Greek alphabets. The treatment of the changes of I.-Eu. η in Greek on p. 125 may be quoted as an example of the author's readiness to

accept the best view available though it involves the abandonment of his previous doctrine. One may regret in passing that Osthoff's wild speculations as to the 'double' treatment of sonant η and η are still given with so much prominence (p. 148), though there is some reserve in their statement. In § 45 a rather fundamental question ('Is Philology an exact science?') is still left without a very explicit answer, and on p. 226 there seems some obscurity in the description of 'the new accent' (in Greek nouns). But these are trivial blemishes in an admirable book.

R. S. CONWAY.

CARDIFF, May 1901.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Euripides Hippolytus. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. E. HARRY. Pp. xlv, 175. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1899. 6s.

It is strange that so seldom appears a new edition of the *Hippolytus*. The press positively reeks with notes on the *Alcestis* or the *Hecuba* or the *Medea*, while not more than about once in ten years does anybody find anything to say in English on the *Hippolytus*—almost the greatest, if not the greatest, monument of Euripides' genius. However, one is content to wait for a good book, and Prof. Harry has given us one.

The introduction is full. The life and opinions of the poet are dealt with at length and then follows a good section on Euripides' 'dramaturgy,' in which the editor defends the Euripidean prologue. From the Euripidean point of view Prof. Harry makes out a good case, though from the artistic standpoint there is little can be said for it. Then follows a criticism of the poet's shortcomings as exemplified in the use of the *deus ex machina*; in the break in interest which occurs in some of the plays; and in the ineffectiveness of the choruses dramatically considered. A brief account of Euripides' style and language succeeds and the remainder of the introduction is taken up with an analysis of the characters of the play, an account of the myth, and a description of the illustrations, eight in number, which occur in the volume. The whole of the introduction is interesting and useful.

The text and notes show Prof. Harry to be a conservative critic. He does not bracket or transpose lines simply because a better sense (as it appears) may be obtained by doing so, nor does he admit emendations needlessly. An emendation is too often made to cut the knot which sympathy with the poet and close study of his thought might have untied. Sometimes however the editor is almost too conservative, as for instance when he retains 32-3. He defends them on p. 148 though in the note below the text he remarks that the text is corrupt. One or two other points may be noticed; in 111, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$ calls for something more luminous than 'more circumstantial and cautious than simple $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ or $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$.' It might seem from the note that $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ might take $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in the construction, which the editor certainly would not intend. 167. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. To the references given might be added *P.V.* 645. There is a good note on $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (200) in which the femininity of Phaedra's character is well brought out. 246. $\delta\mu\mu\alpha$ surely means 'face' here; cf. 'shame hath covered my face.' 270. Is it not rather too strong to say that the use of $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is an innovation of Euripides? There are three instances at least in Aeschylus—*P.V.* 867, 929. *Pers.* 215. 328. $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \tau\upsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is taken in the sense of 'fail to keep thee' = to lose thee, instead of 'fail to gain my request from thee.' The following lines, too, taking Prof. Harry's interpretation of the thought, make good sense without transposition or omission (Nauck). There seems no sufficient reason

for omitting them. 513-15 are in brackets. The editor here has followed Nauck and most editors. But we may be sure that the poet knew what he was doing when he made the nurse indulge in a bit of folk-lore. 1167. Another example of sigmatism might have been quoted from the play 295, as well as the line from the *Medea*. 1186. Some explanation of λέγοι without ἀν should have been given. The references quoted for the construction do not seem strictly parallel. But there is little room for fault finding. The notes throughout are clear and to the point. A feature which cannot pass without remark is the great number of apposite quotations which Prof. Harry has collected from modern authors in illustration of the thought of the play. They certainly add much to the interest of an excellent edition.

H. ELLERSHAW.

Xenophon de Vectigalibus V. 9 und die Ueberlieferung vom Anfang des phokischen Krieges bei Diodor. Von Oberlehrer AEMILIUS PINTSCHOWIUS. Hadersleben, 1900. Printed by W. L. Schütze.

THE starting point of this dissertation is the passage in the *Πόροι* of Xenophon; it is, however, chiefly concerned with the account in Diodorus of the origin of the Sacred War. The author's conclusions may be summarised as follows. The seizure of the temple at Delphi is to be put in the archonship of Agathocles, 357/6, and took place about June 356; so that the war, which was regarded as ending with the *ῥοπή τῶν διανομημένων τὰ ἐπὶ χρήματα* (Diod. xvi. 14), i.e. with the devastation of Phocis in August 346, lasted in reality a few months over the

ten years. He argues at length in favour of Volquardsen's view that the inconsistencies and repetitions in Diodorus xvi. 28 ff. as compared with Ch. 23-27 indicate a difference of source. He regards Ephorus as the authority followed by Diodorus in the earlier part of book xvi., down to the end of ch. 27, except in the chapters relating to Philip, which he assigns to Theopompus, from whose *Philippica* he supposes the latter part of the book to have been, in the main, derived. The Sicilian chapters in this part of the book come from Timaeus, although he maintains that Ephorus is the authority followed for Sicilian affairs down to ch. 27. He asserts the Xenophontic authorship of the *Πόροι*, and suggests the summer of 355 as the date of its composition, the passage in V. 9 being inspired by the Paocian embassy which he supposes to have been sent to Athens by Philomelus about this time.

The dissertation is a conscientious piece of work, marked, unfortunately, by an absence of method and style which one has come to associate with compositions of this sort. The most important contribution which the writer makes to the solution of the difficult problems of which he treats is his hypothesis that the whole of the thirtieth book of Ephorus' work was written by his son Demophilus. It has hitherto been inferred from the references in Diodorus that Ephorus carried down his history to the siege of Perinthus, and that Demophilus was responsible only for the account of the Sacred War. A strong case is made out in favour of this hypothesis; and, if it is accepted, it would furnish a plausible explanation for Diodorus' parting company, at the end of ch. 27, with Ephorus, to whom he has been so faithful up to that point.

E. M. WALKER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CLASSICS IN EDUCATION.

[We print below underneath a covering letter of Dr. GRANGER of University College, Nottingham, the first of two communications whose contents seem likely to excite both interest and dissent among readers of the *Classical Review*:—ED. C.R.]

These two letters upon Classical Education were not written, in the first instance, in order to be published. Their writer chose this way of expressing his objections to the discipline to which, as will appear, he was subjected in the usual course at Oxford. The letters summarise from one side a rather lengthy correspondence in which two

of his friends took the other side, and, perhaps, may be of service to lovers of the classical tradition by showing where that tradition has borne somewhat heavily in a typical case. It is with this intention that my friend has allowed me to submit his criticisms to the editor of the *Classical Review*.

The somewhat surprising references to Latin accent in the second letter relate, I understand, not to stress, but to tone. For that matter Dr. Key, when he was headmaster of University College School, used to have Plautus and Terence chanted by the sixth form. At least I am so informed by one of his old boys.

F. GRANGER.

TWO LETTERS TO A CLASSICAL FRIEND.

I.

My Dear —,

I am dissatisfied to leave our discussions on the Classics and their place in Education, at the stage which we have at present reached. I am reluctant that you should credit me with a love of letters, and especially of Poetry, inferior to your own, though of course I make no pretension to your scholarship, and though Literature, while it is a great and permanent interest in my mind, yet is not with me, as it has been I think with you, the chief business of the intellectual life. And it is because I find myself unable to make the study of the Classics, in any substantial measure, subservient to the love of letters, that I have, in our former conversations, directed my attack against the system of Classical Education. Such a conclusion is quite as disappointing to me as it must be disagreeable to yourself, and yet my personal experience leaves me no choice but to draw it. I want to make it more plain to you than I could in desultory talk, that I must not be understood to pass judgment on the classic texts, from any other point of view than that of the learner. Indeed, and this is an important part of my case, I feel that, after all the labour I have bestowed upon them, I am still incompetent to apprehend or weigh their merits and defects. The only question upon which I have formed an opinion is not, 'What is the intrinsic value of Classical Literature?' but this humbler, if to me more pressing enquiry, 'What is the learner likely to get out of it?'

You will remember that my education was unusual, although I fear that the result, so far as the Classics are concerned, is

typical; typical, that is, of the experience of the majority. Being as a lad very delicate, I was brought up at home, in a rather solitary fashion. I knew neither Greek nor Latin, nor did I begin them until I was eighteen years of age. But I read English verse with avidity, and wrote it with enthusiasm, as a boy should. Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Cowper: all that the Globe editions on our shelves could afford me was read and taken in to the best of my ability. I read through the *Faerie Queene* from beginning to end. I read through *Paradise Lost* three times, though I must admit that I did not begin to appreciate it until the third reading. In French I read sundry plays of Corneille and Racine and Molière, I think with some, though no doubt with imperfect appreciation. But I have never looked at them since. I wanted to read all the great poets of the world. I read Cary's translation of the *Divine Comedy*. I read Virgil in a crib. I read right through Cowper's tedious translation of Homer, in which nothing moved or interested me, except the last book of the *Iliad*, where Priam goes to Achilles to beg the body of Hector. And then, at eighteen, I went to a tutor, and began Greek and Latin, and for four years I did nothing else. In my twenty-first year I matriculated at Oxford, and at twenty-two I took a third in Moderations. What did I gain by this four years' work?

Bear in mind that I approached the study of the Classics with the keenest love of poetry, and with the strongest prepossession in their favour. For Matriculation I took up two plays of Euripides. I got nothing out of the *Hecuba*. Out of the *Alcestis* I got perhaps as much as I might have gained by reading 'Balaustion's Adventure,' not more. I remember that at Matriculation I had the cheek to turn a passage of Euripides into verse. Indeed I eagerly, though vainly, desired to assimilate what I read, as Poetry. What else was the good of reading it? In the midst of these tasks, I sought and gained some comfort, in learning by heart the magnificent passage of Milton which begins:

Thus far these beyond
Compare of mortal prowess, yet observed
Their dread commander.

Will you bear with me when I say that these eighty lines have been to me of more value than all the classics put together?

At this time I also read Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, I. II. and IV. It would be ungrateful to pass over the Latin prose

texts, Caesar, B. G. I-IV. and Livy, XXI. XXII.; for they helped to teach me the Latin language, and to them I have returned in later years. I now took the Oxford and Cambridge Certificate Examination, so that when I came into residence, the field was clear for Mods. I decided to go in for Honours, chiefly, I think, because I wanted to read the great texts. I was still not strong; I worked very slowly, with painstaking accuracy. I had not learned to measure the labour required for a given task. I recollect sitting up till five o'clock one morning over a piece of Latin Prose, which I could not lick into shape. This was no doubt due to a fastidious judgment, with resources inadequate for its satisfaction.

I began Homer. I was completely baffled by the difficulties of the language, and unable to keep up with the lectures, of which I recall only the lecturer's sardonic remark that 'Nothing new and at the same time true can possibly be said about Homer.' Of the twelve books of the Odyssey (XIII-XXIV) which I offered for examination, I never read more than seven. And my Homer paper got a Second! At least this might gratify my sense of humour. But what concerned me more was that in these seven books I never experienced the least gleam of poetry. I dreamed, however, of a return to Homer under more favourable circumstances, with no lectures and no examinations.

I took up two-thirds of Virgil:—the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the first half of the Aeneid; and I read these through most carefully, with the abridged edition of Conington. I found no poetry in the Eclogues. Of the Georgics I retain one line:—*Fluminaque antiquos subterlabentia muros*. That charmed me, partly because it set me thinking of that 'haunt of ancient Peace,' the Bishop's Palace at Wells, familiar to me from childhood. But I had to hurry on to the Aeneid. This could not but leave upon my mind a certain impression of stateliness and majesty, amid much convention, comparable to the dignity of *Paradise Lost*. I learned by heart the lines

O socii, neque enim ignari sumus ante malarum, et cetera

for the sake of the encouragement contained in them, which truly I much needed. And as with Homer, so with Virgil, or at least the Aeneid, I thought some day I would read it again. But the predominating impression which Virgil left upon my mind, was that of sheer fag, of the stiffest piece of

grind which I had ever gone through. And you know I still retain the opinion that grind is one thing, and poetry quite another, as different (to put it briefly) as Martha and Mary.

Demosthenes De Corona I read in the Long Vacation, among the ruins of Bramber Castle. I liked it well enough, but it did not rouse my enthusiasm. I don't think I ever quite finished it, and I have never looked at it since. Cicero's letters (Watson Part V.) interested me, and the Philippics (I-VII.) increased my knowledge of Latin, perhaps of Rome. And I read the De Senectute for my own pleasure; also, I think, the first book of the Tusculans.

I took up for examination Aristophanes and Juvenal. Of these texts I only accomplished a part, but the reckless humour of the first, and the bitter satire of the second, chimed in precisely with my mood, and gave it a kind of expression. At the same time I found a powerful intellectual stimulus in the vast collections of Prof. Mayor. But the consequence was that out of thirteen satires I only read seven. It was of more value to me to gain the idea of learning.

Somehow I scraped through Mods. Nay, I did more than scrape through, for six of my papers (Latin Prose, Homer, Virgil, Aristophanes, Juvenal, Unseen) got a Second. But I was too much discouraged and dis-illusioned to care about anything beyond getting through. I had now to consider whether I should go in for Greats. Without much hesitation I decided in the negative. It was neither the Philosophy, nor the History, nor the Language, but the Literature, and above all the famous Poetry of Greece and Rome, which had in the first instance attracted me. I had since come to see that the study of the Classics was a highly technical and traditional study, which could not with advantage be approached except by those who had already in boyhood been initiated into the classical education of our public schools. It required not four years' work but fourteen. The product of this system was *l'homme moyen classique*, the average classical man. An outsider could not hope to put himself on a level with the men of this type, nor in truth did I greatly desire to do so. I felt, rightly or wrongly, that the study of the classics was not pursued for its own sake, but as part of an established system of education, of which the value and importance were rather taken for granted than really felt or proved. To me, and to most others on my own level of attainment, it was just mere cram and grind

and shop, and could by no possibility be anything more. There was nothing in all this to gratify the love of Letters, the love of Nature, the love of Beauty. No experience could be less Hellenic, or less Humane. The classics, I then felt, and I feel still, were hackneyed to death, and nothing short of a miracle could impart to them the least touch of freshness. A classic text to me both was and is, a thing of verbs and adjectives; of the grammar and the lexicon; and the study of it had no more to do with Poetry than it had to do with Chemistry. Indeed the one solid result which I brought off from four years' work was not literary but scientific;—a certain grip of the Latin language and an elementary knowledge of Greek. It is a curious reflection that the only Greek book which has ever been of any real value to me, is the Greek Bible.

I therefore *chucked* the classics with a

βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας, with mingled feelings of mortification and relief. For myself the grapes were sour, and I gladly turned to other and, on the whole, more congenial subjects. Yet there has always remained with me, lurking in the background of my mind, an unsatisfied desire to return once more to the classical literature, and if possible to find there some part at least of the treasures which it is supposed to afford the student. And the occasion of our discussions has arisen out of my very unsuccessful efforts to achieve this result, efforts which, as you know, have only revived and strengthened the painful conviction that *Classical Books should be left to Classical Men.*

I remain, my Dear—,

Your assured friend,

G. H. S.

October, 1900.

(To be continued.)

ΣΜΙΝΘΕΥΣ, PESTILENCE AND MICE.

A propos of Mr. Godley's note on Σμινθεύς in the May *C.R.*, it is a curious coincidence that in the May number of the *Expository Times* there is a paper by a medical missionary, the Rev. J. C. Gibson, M.A., M.D., of Swatow, designed to prove that the fifth and sixth chapters of the first book of Samuel describe an outbreak of bubonic plague, and that the 'mice that mar the land' are rats, mentioned because of their carrying disease. Dr. Gibson observes that Hitzig recalled in this connexion the association of Apollo with plague, under the epithet Smintheus. He tells us that bubonic plague is commonly called 'rat plague' in China to-day. The independent confirmation of an interesting theory thus supplied seems worthy to be brought to the notice of readers of the *C.R.* who may not have seen it.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

In a paper upon some Homeric questions in the May number, Mr. Godley discussed the connection between mice and pestilence, and would explain it as the result of the knowledge acquired from Egypt of the fact that mice and rats carry disease. Is it not simpler to explain this connection as the result of an oriental metaphor? With the same suddenness and thoroughness that mice destroy crops, does pestilence destroy

men. It is noticeable that in almost every instance where the connection has been found the mouse mentioned has been the shrew-mouse. We know how great are the ravages of mice in corn-land from the elaborate spells found in Teutonic mythology to get rid of them. A possible explanation of the differing accounts of the destruction of Sennacherib is that the Assyrian folk-tales or chronicles described the destruction of the army by 'pestilence,' using what to them may have been the common metaphor of 'mice.' In after ages when the metaphorical signification of mice had been lost, the story of them gnawing the bowstrings was invented, to explain how mice could work the destruction of an army. It is significant that the Philistines, when they sent back the ark, were advised by their priests and diviners to 'make images of your emerods and images of your mice that mar the land,' (Sam. i. v. 9), though no mention of the ravages of mice is made. The words 'that mar the land' seem almost to be inserted in an explanatory way to show why they were included in the offering.

The story of the gnawing of the bowstrings in the Troad and the similar story in Chinese legends, both referred to by Mr. Lang, may have originated in the same way, or merely be other forms of the same story.

The connection between mice and disease being established by this metaphor, it is a short step to the idea that mice have some control over disease; and therefore the author of the Homeric poems regards it as quite natural to address Apollo in his capacity of the mouse-god, when he has afflicted the Greeks with a pestilence.

A. T. C. CREE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

[Mr. Cree's explanation of the puzzling passage in the First Book of Samuel (not the least of whose difficulties is the discrepancy between the Hebrew and LXX. texts) would appear to be the same as that

of Prof. Wellhausen, and, after him, of Prof. Driver in his '*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*' (on I. Sam. vi. 21), viz. that the mouse is a symbol (Bild) of pestilence. There is a somewhat similar legend in the Arabic chronicle of Tabari of the destruction of the Abyssinian army when marching against Mecca. 'So God sent birds like swallows in swarms from the sea; each carried three stones, one in its beak and two in its claws, of the size of a chick pea or lentil. Those who were struck died: but not all were struck.' Other accounts, however, represent the army as attacked by small pox. See Nöldeke's *Geschichte der Perser u. Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, pp. 213 sqq.—Ed. C.R.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

BERNOULLI'S GREEK ICONOGRAPHY.

Griechische Ikonographie, mit Ausschluss Alexanders und der Diadochen. Von J. J. Bernoulli. Erster Theil: Die Bildnisse berühmter Griechen von der Vorzeit bis an das Ende des V. Jahr. v. Chr. München. 1901. 16 M.

GREEK and Roman portrait sculpture has been for many years sadly neglected in comparison with other branches of Archaeology. Since Visconti's *Iconographie Grecque* was published in 1808, there has appeared no important work dealing with the portraits of celebrated Greeks, until a few years ago Dr. Arndt began the issue of his splendid series of plates called *Griechische und Römische Porträts*. Even Arndt only adds a few lines of text to each plate; portraiture as a branch of ancient art has only been treated of in a few short papers by Michaelis, Winter, Six and others. Hence every one interested in ancient art must have been delighted to hear that Prof. Bernoulli of Basel, whose *Römische Ikonographie* is so valuable a work, was preparing a kindred book on Greek portraits.

Prof. Bernoulli's book is of great value, a solid and laborious piece of work. If I point out some respects in which it does not fulfil all one's hopes, I must not be supposed to underrate its undeniable merits.

There are two lines of study in relation to Greek portraits which claim attention;

first, the history of portraiture as a branch of art, second, the recovery of the features of great men. The second of these lines of study is that to which the book before us will most contribute, and it is the most obviously attractive; and yet some previous attention to the first is a necessary preliminary; for until the date and artistic character of a statue is determined, it is of unknown value, and we cannot decide how far to trust it, or what allowance to make for the personal bias of the sculptor.

It is thus greatly to be regretted that Dr. Bernoulli does not preface his work by a summary history of portrait-sculpture among the Greeks; had he done so, he would have handled Greek portraits with more decision and more insight. Taking these up as he does one by one, with no formulated principles to refer to, he sometimes falls into inconsistencies. His plan is to discuss the certainly or probably identified portraits of eminent Greeks in the order of their historic succession. But it is certain that the date of their life is by no means always the date of the portrait which we possess, and thus from the first we are apt to lose touch with chronologic succession. The first portrait discussed is that of Homer. But of course the portrait of Homer is a mere fanciful invention, dating from Hellenistic days. The earliest contemporary portrait which we can with confidence attribute is that of Pericles, which comes about the middle of Prof. Bernoulli's book. Thus it is clear that the arrangement of the work, though no doubt

it has some practical advantages, is such as to mix up styles and periods of art. If it was impossible to preserve a chronological succession from the point of view of art, which is probably the case, at all events mere fancy portraits of persons who lived, or were supposed to have lived, before the days of portraits, should be placed in a separate class.

On the other hand Prof. Bernoulli successfully defends himself against those critics who would have had him leave to the notes or an appendix all such portraits as are not certainly authentic. As he observes, such a rule would have taken away three fourths of his subject. One only regrets the number of distinctive portraits of known date and character which his plan has obliged him to reject, because it is not clear whom among half a dozen possibilities they really represent.

In collecting his materials Prof. Bernoulli is excellent. He seldom omits any known evidence, and seldom fails to record and consider the opinion of any recognized authority. His judgment is usually sane and trustworthy. It may however be expected, after what has been already said, that he is somewhat less satisfactory in dealing with really difficult questions as to the relations of various portraits of the same person to one another, and as to their authors. We can perhaps best do justice to the work before us by examining in somewhat closer detail the sections of it dealing with two groups of portraits, those of Sophocles and those of Euripides.

The portraits of Sophocles fall naturally into three groups, first, those which represent him in advanced age, of which group perhaps the best example is the herm in the British Museum, second, those grouped about the magnificent standing statue of the Lateran, in which he is greatly idealized, and third, heads of an earlier type which may date from the fifth century, of which there are examples in the British Museum, at Berlin, and elsewhere.

These portraits Dr. Bernoulli had already discussed in a paper in the *Archäologisches Jahrbuch* for 1896; and in so doing he had burdened himself with a most unnecessary assumption, that it was impossible (*geradezu unbegreiflich*) that the Greeks can have handed down to us two different portrait types of the same man. Why so strange a thesis should be maintained does not appear. The thesis is not only arbitrary, but contrary even to historic evidence; for we are told by Plutarch with regard to Alexander the

Great that many artists represented him in various styles, until he finally chose Lysippus as his court sculptor. And the statement of Plutarch is fully confirmed by the great variety of extant portraits of Alexander. It surely stands to reason that other eminent men would be sculptured at various times of life and by various hands. But Dr. Bernoulli in the paper referred to is so much a victim of his *a priori* principle that he denies that the elderly portraits of Sophocles represent him at all, because they differ from the Lateran portrait.

In the work before us, Dr. Bernoulli so far relaxes the rigour of his one-type view that he allows the authenticity of the elderly portraits, which indeed can scarcely be denied. But on the other hand he feels constrained to deny that the Lateran statue is a portrait in the strict sense of the word. It is 'eine selbständige Neuschöpfung.' And the third group of portraits he regards as not representing Sophocles at all, but only someone resembling him. I cannot see any need for such procedure. Dr. Bernoulli would certainly have come nearer to the truth if he had proceeded on less rigid lines, and contented himself with the generally received view as to the portraits of the second and third groups, that the heads of the third group are copies of a contemporary portrait of the poet, and the Lateran statue a noble but not unfaithful transcript of them in the style of the fourth century.

In the case of the portraits of Euripides, also, I think Dr. Bernoulli's too determined search for a type has misled him. He regards the two well-known heads at Naples and at Mantua as going back to one original, 'deutlich auf das gleiche Original zurückgehend.' This may be the case; but the Mantua head is of a quite different and a distinctly later style of art than that of Naples. The Naples head may be a copy not greatly modified from a contemporary portrait; the Mantua head is a work of Hellenistic style, with marked expression, naturalistic rendering of the skin, and undercut locks of hair. All this Dr. Bernoulli has not noted.

It is evident that all portraits of noted Greeks who lived later than the middle of the fifth century must be dependent in a considerable degree on true contemporary portraits. To study the manner in which these contemporary portraits are translated and altered by sculptors of later ages and various schools would be a most important piece of work, and one which would greatly further our knowledge of ancient sculpture.

However it is more pleasant, instead of noting what Dr. Bernoulli has not attempted, to thank him for what he has accomplished. He has put together in most useful form the mass of evidence as to early Greek portraiture, and his work, combined with the plates of Arndt's great series, may help towards still further progress in this most interesting branch of archaeology.

P. GARDNER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Naundorf in Hochwald, near Trier. Remains of a Roman temple have come to light, including over 100 well-preserved votive figures in terracotta, mostly female deities with attributes, some with remains of colouring; also eight bronze figures (four of Mars, one of Jupiter, and one of Mercury).¹

ROUMANIA.

Konstanza. A large tomb which has lately been found contained wall-paintings on the stone walls which were covered with stucco. On one wall three figures were preserved: Herakles, a woman with a roll, and a seated woman behind whom is an elephant; on another wall, two Victories, a youth seated by a ship, and a boy with a basket of fruit.²

ITALY.

Pompeii. The remarkable bronze statue recently discovered has now been placed in the Naples Museum. It is 3 ft. 10½ in. high and is entirely covered with a coating of silver, the eyes being in white marble with inlaid pupils.¹

Rome. Sig. Lanciani writes to correct a statement made by him in previous notes (see *C.R.* for April, p. 192). The new fragment of the marble plan is not from the first edition of Vespasian's time, nor does it represent the older Pantheon, but it forms part of the Baths of Agrippa and dates from Septimius Severus like the rest.³

GREECE.

Athens. In a disused well 100 vases of the Roman period have been found, resembling those discovered

by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt in the Fayûm, with incised geometrical patterns; one has painted yellow and brown ornaments. On the spot where the Ilissos is crossed by the middle line of the Long Walls a cemetery of about 400 B.C. has been excavated. Each tomb contained a marble or terracotta sarcophagus containing a coffin of wood with bronze nails; the ashes in many cases were placed in marble vessels or urns of bronze and terracotta. Among the painted vases found were lekythi, pyxides, etc. of the usual types, also several *loutrophoroi*, one with an Amazonomachia; a lebes with a flute-player and dancers; and a *pelike* with Theseus and the Marathonian bull. Other finds which may be mentioned are sundry bronze objects, leaden *dirae* inscribed with imprecations, marble vases and inscribed *stelae*, and various terracottas (figures of Pan and Selenos, birds and dogs, and gilt rosettes).²

Eretria. Tombs have come to light containing fifth-century lekythi, and a considerable number of gold ornaments, including necklaces of acorns and animals' heads, a diadem with reliefs, and finger-rings. Others date from the seventh century, and contained early amphorae, one of the Dipylon class with a funeral procession. Among the white-ground lekythi was one with the subject of Hypnos and Thanatos.²

Thera. Hiller von Gaertringen has finished excavating the plan of the upper city, which consists mainly of private houses. One was of a complicated plan and contained in one chamber a number of Hellenistic terracottas; in two of the rooms were wall-paintings, resembling the First or Incrustation style of Pompeian wall-decoration. Other discoveries range from polygonal walls of an early period to remains of Byzantine times. The Agora has been shown to consist of three distinct terraces extending for about 120 yards north and south; on the middle one was a temple of the Ptolemies and Caesars, and on the north side three exedrae erected by persons in the Augustan age, as shown by inscriptions. Two high columns which evidently formed a pair bore an honorary inscription of the second century B.C., together with a long list of *procuratores*. On the road leading down from the Agora were found a quantity of early inscriptions cut in the rock; one in iambic trimeters which relates to a Carneian festival established by one Agloteles has been published in *Hermes*, 1901, p. 134.²

Aegina. It is reported that no fewer than nine heads have been found belonging to the pedimental sculptures of the temple which are now at Munich; the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* of May 4 was to contain full details of these finds, but at the time of writing is not to hand.

H. B. WALTERS.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxi, 4. Whole No. 84. 1900.

The Athenian Democracy in the Light of Greek Literature, A. Leach. *The Ocean in Sanskrit Epic Poetry*, W. Hopkins. *The Greek in Cicero's Epistles*, R. B. Steele. *On the Wedding Stanza, Rig-Veda*, x. 40, 10, M. Bloomfield. *The Manuscripts of the Letters of Cicero to Atticus in the Vatican Library*, S. B. Platner. *Note on Acharnians 947*, C. Bonner. *On Greek and Latin Negatives*, F. H. Fowler. *On*

the Septuagint Text of I. Samuel 20, 3 and Epistle of Jeremiah 26, J. W. Rice.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES. Schmalz's *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (E. B. Lense), Koch's *Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige* (W. C. France), Rothstein's *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (K. F. Smith).

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 25, 2. April 1901.

Les jeux en l'honneur du proconsul Q. Mucius Scaevola, P. Foucart. An inscr. from Olympia.

¹ *Athenaeum*, March 23.

² *Athen. Mittheil.* xxv. pt. 4 (1900), p. 452 ff.

³ *Athenaeum*, April 13.

La famille d'Herode Atticus, P. Foucart. An inscr. from Athens. *Plautus* Asin. 99, 100. Th. Kakridis. Suggests in 100 *venari item lepuscum in medio mari*. *Terentius* Phormio, L. Havet. Critical notes. *Platon et l'origine des minéraux*, F. de Mély. Certain passages of the *Timaeus* quoted and discussed, in which we may recognize the beginning of the science of mineralogy. *Plin.* N.H. viii. 165, E. Chatelain. *Profundius* is a gloss and is not found in a palimpsest of P. in MS. 24 of the Grand Séminaire of Autun. *Langue et style de Victor de Vita*, F. Ferrère. A contribution to the study of African Latin. *Baris*, B. Keil. On the mention of this town in an inscr. found near the temple of Apollo Didymaeus and lately published by B. Haussoullier. *Les Séleucides et le temple d'Apollon Didyméen*, B. Haussoullier. Further inscriptions, of the reign of Seleucus II. *Une nouvelle borne milliaire de Lydie-Le proconsul Dulcitius*, B. Haussoullier. An inscr. from Koz-bounar between Ephesus and Sardis.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.
1901.

17 April. *Thucydides Historiae*, rec. H. S. Jones. II. (S. Widmann). 'Handy, though not of much importance.' *Ciceros Reden gegen Catilina und für Archias*, erkl. von K. Halm. 14. A. von G. Laubmann (W. Hirschfelder), very favourable. R. Thiele, *Horaz und sein Säkulargedicht* (W. Hirschfelder), 'Much to be commended.' E. Wölfflin, *Zur Komposition der Historien des Tacitus* (G. Andresen). 'Reaches only a negative result' Guil. Heydenreich, *De Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae libro X, de Dionysii Halicarnassensis de imitatione libro II, de canone qui dicitur Alexandrino quaestiones* (O. Kröhnert), unfavourable.

24 April. *Festschrift*, C. F. W. Müller zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet (C. Haeberlin). Contains the following: Max Treu, *Die Gesandtschaftsreise des Rhetors Theodulos Magistros*; A. Ludwig, *Beiträge zur Homerischen Handschriftenkunde*; F. Skutsch, *Zur Wortzusammensetzung im Lateinischen*; R. Wünsch, *Zu Sophrons Tal γυναικες αὐ τὰν θεῶν παντ*

ἐξελαῖν; K. Dziatzko, *Das neue Fragment der Περικλομένης des Menander*; W. Kroll, *Studien über die Komposition der Aeneis*; R. Förster, *Die Kasusangleichung des Relativpronomen im Lateinischen*; and F. Marx, *Digitis computans*. F. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*. 4. A. (V. Prášek), favourable. M. W. de Visser, *De Graecorum diis non referentibus speciem humanam* (H. Steuding), favourable. J. Schöne, *De dialecto Bacchylidea* (C. Haeberlin). 'Deserves cordial recognition.' *Demetrii Cydonii de contemnenda morte oratio*, ed. H. Deckelmann (C. Fries). 'Welcome to specialists on Byzantine literature.' A. Uppgren, *De verborum peculiaribus et propriis numeris*. III. (H. D.), unfavourable. *Cicero, I tre libri de oratore*, da A. Cima. *Libro I*, sec. ed. (W. Hirschfelder), very favourable. *Ovidii Metamorphoses*, Auswahl von J. Meuser. 7. A. von A. Egen (C. Fries), favourable. D. Detlefsen, *Die Beschreibung Italiens in der Naturalis Historia des Plinius* (J. Müller), favourable. P. Natrop, *Was uns die Griechen sind* (O. Weissenfels), favourable.

1 May. J. B. Bury, *A history of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great* (A. Höck) I. Gualth. Sanell, *Quaestiones Platonicae* (M. Wohlrab). On the attempt to determine the order of Plato's writings from the evidence of language. *Paulys Real-encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearb. von G. Wissowa. 7. Halbband (F. Harder. Zusatz von G. Andresen).

8 May. E. Kammer, *Ein aesthetischer Kommentar zu Homers Ilias* (G. Vogrinz), very favourable. J. B. Bury, *A history of Greece* (A. Höck) II. 'Very stimulating and full of learning.' R. Frese, *Beiträge zur Beurteilung der Sprache Cäsars* (H. Ziemer). 'An excellent treatise.' Th. Fitz-Hugh, *Outlines of a System of Classical Pedagogy* (H. Ziemer), favourable.

15 May. A. Solari, *Osservazioni sulla pretesa potenza marittima degli Spartani* (A. Höck), favourable. J. Valaori, *Der delphische Dialekt* (P. Kreschmer), favourable. *Horati opera*, rec. E. C. Wickham (W. Hirschfelder). 'A careful and well-considered edition of the text.' A. Romano, *Osservazioni Pliniane* (F. Münzer), unfavourable.